

AD-A260 225

Leadership Behavior of Male and Female Coaches  
of Women's Intercollegiate Softball

A Report  
Presented to  
the Faculty of the School of Education  
San Diego State University

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Course  
Education 795 (A and B) Seminar

Dr. Al Merino

by  
Peggy L. Lau  
November 1992

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

DTIC  
ELECTE  
FEB 05 1993  
S E D

Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	<i>per form 50</i>
By _____	
Distribution /	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
<i>A-1</i>	

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT  
Approved for public release  
Distribution Unlimited

93-02066



93 2 3 083

①

Leadership Behavior of Male and Female Coaches  
of Women's Intercollegiate Softball

-----  
A Report  
Presented to  
the Faculty of the School of Education  
San Diego State University  
-----

DTIC  
ELECTE  
FEB 05 1993  
S E D

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Course  
Education 795 (A and B) Seminar

Dr. Al Merino  
-----

by  
Peggy L. Lau  
November 1992

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	<i>Per form 50</i>
By _____	
Distribution /	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
<i>A-1</i>	

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT**  
Approved for public release  
Distribution Unlimited

93-02066



93 2 3 083

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	1v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	5
Statement of the Hypothesis . . . . .	5
Scope of the Study . . . . .	5
Significance of the Study . . . . .	5
II. RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	15
Leadership . . . . .	15
Leadership Theories . . . . .	19
Characteristics of the Coach . . . . .	28
Measurement of Behaviors . . . . .	33
Types of Instruments . . . . .	33
Types of Environments Studies . . . . .	35
Questionnaire Use in Athletics . . . . .	39
Studies of Athletic Personnel . . . . .	43
Leadership Behavior Description	
Questionnaire . . . . .	56
Descriptions . . . . .	56
Development and Uses of the LBDQ . . . . .	56
III. MATERIALS AND METHODS . . . . .	60
Selection of Subjects . . . . .	60
Construction of Instrument . . . . .	60
Administration of Instrument . . . . .	61
Statistical Procedures . . . . .	62
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS . . . . .	63
Comparison between Male and Female Coaches . . . . .	63
Discussion of Results . . . . .	68

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	5
Statement of the Hypothesis . . . . .	5
Scope of the Study . . . . .	5
Significance of the Study . . . . .	5
II. RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	15
Leadership . . . . .	15
Leadership Theories . . . . .	19
Characteristics of the Coach . . . . .	28
Measurement of Behaviors . . . . .	33
Types of Instruments . . . . .	33
Types of Environments Studies . . . . .	35
Questionnaire Use in Athletics . . . . .	39
Studies of Athletic Personnel . . . . .	43
Leadership Behavior Description	
Questionnaire . . . . .	56
Descriptions . . . . .	56
Development and Uses of the LBDQ . . . . .	56
III. MATERIALS AND METHODS . . . . .	60
Selection of Subjects . . . . .	60
Construction of Instrument . . . . .	60
Administration of Instrument . . . . .	61
Statistical Procedures . . . . .	62
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS . . . . .	63
Comparison between Male and Female Coaches	63
Discussion of Results . . . . .	68

## CHAPTER

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	70
Summary . . . . .	70
Conclusions . . . . .	70
Recommendations . . . . .	71
APPENDIX . . . . .	72
1. Letter to Participants . . . . .	72
2. The Ohio State University Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire . . . . .	73
3. The Ohio State University LBDO Policy Statement . . . . .	76
4. The LBDO User's Manual . . . . .	77
5. Athletes' Questionnaire . . . . .	87
6. Coaches' Questionnaire . . . . .	89
7. Demographic Data on Participating Athletes . . . . .	91
8. Questionnaire Scores by Sex . . . . .	93
9. Questionnaire Scores by Coaching Position . . . . .	100
10. Questionnaire Scores by Sex and Position . . . . .	107
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	129

## LIST OF TABLES

1. t-Test for Significance in Comparing Male and  
Female Coaches of Women's Softball . . . . . 64
2. Statistics for Consideration and Initiating  
Structure for Softball Coaches by Sex and  
Coaching Position . . . . . 65
3. Summary of Results of the Analysis of  
Consideration Among the Coaching Groups . . . . . 66
4. Summary of Results of the Analysis of Variance  
for Comparison of Mean Initiating Structure  
Among the Coaching Groups . . . . . 66

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to dedicate this work to my family and friends who stood by me regardless of how cantankerous and difficult I became.

I would like to specifically like to thank the following:

- My mother for her love and for not criticizing my grammar.
- My father for teaching me persistence and instilling the belief that I can do anything I set my mind to.
- The Navy for giving me the opportunity to dip into the well, that I may in turn lead others to the fountain of knowledge.
- Dr. Ron Jacobs for having unwavering faith and trust in my ability and integrity.
- Dr. Al Merino for his enthusiasm and unconditional love of his Navy students and of his subject area.
- Pat Baker for her patience (where she normally has none), her belief in me (where I normally have none), and for her excellent administrative skills and support.
- Maria Plasencia for being the best worrier, proofreader, and friend.

I would like to thank all of them for helping me accomplish something I once thought unobtainable. I promise to give them fair warning to leave town before I enroll for my Ph.D.

## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

"I am the teacher of athletics. He that by me spreads a wider breast than my own proves the width of my own. He most honors my style who learns under it to destroy the teacher." (Whitman, 1961, p. 98) Walt Whitman gave a short yet simple observation of coaching in his "Leaves of Grass" collection of poems. Things have become much more intense and sophisticated today. Coaches have fallen away from the ideals expressed in his few lines. Researchers have measured all manner of statistics and made all types of observations and have used these to proclaim athletes, coaches, and programs to be good or bad as a result. It would be nice to return to the simplicity of Whitman's day and find a measurement that is fair, precise, significant, and can provide information as to how and where to improve.

In athletics, assessment needs are often met in a "helter-skelter" manner, if at all. Many times the evaluation is solely based on the seasonal record and the intangibles are forgotten or never considered. Walt Whitman's philosophy of coaching in athletics seems to advocate an intangible, yet measurable, aspect of the



coaching profession. How well do coaches lead their athletes? How well do coaches pass along knowledge? How well do they teach skills? Can these aspects be measured? If so, this data could play a major role in the assessment of athletics. Men's athletics have been allowed to go on for years with little or no real effort at documented assessment. (Cratty, 1981) As women's athletics began to grow in collegiate settings, some may have assumed that data derived from men's programs could be applied equally to female athletes. The question arises: Can studies involving men actually be applied to women athletes and the coaches of women athletes? Clark (1974) noted that O. G. Ruble suggested that factors which produced weakness in men's athletic programs should be analyzed to help better prepare women's programs in order to avoid the same problems. This would suggest that it is important to look at men's programs as a guideline for women's programs, but as Taylor (1987) noted, cross-sex comparison is difficult. Such a generalization across sexes cannot be made in light of the studies cited by Taylor that profile differences that exist between male and female athletes. Taylor concluded that, "as a consequence, external validation across sexes of a particular finding for males would require a replication of the research involving females." (p. 12).

In the past, men's sports were coached by men and

women's sports were coached by women. This is no longer a hard and fast rule, as men and women are now involved in coaching both programs. Since coaches can have a great influence upon their athletes, understanding coaches' behavior should be a vital area of study. Researchers should find out what the special relationship is in the coach-athlete dyad and then determine why it exists, what its ramifications may be and how it may be altered for better or worse. The researcher should examine how this relationship may be different for female athletes and how data concerning this relationship may be applied, equally or differently, to female athletics. A good place to start improving either the athlete or the athletic program is by improving the coach. The athletes only evolve after the coach has evolved. The coach must lead the way while teaching the athlete the skills necessary to replicate this leadership role someday. Coaches can teach athletes by example through the way they behave and lead. The example set may be remembered long after the practice sessions have been forgotten. By studying the leadership and behavior practices of coaches, researchers can accumulate data about the kind of example coaches are setting for their athletes. By understanding what kind of example they are setting, coaches can make whatever changes are necessary to better themselves, their athletes, and their programs. Espagnac (1987) expresses a 1980's view of Whitman's ideology.

The art of coaching may consist of developing an athlete from the embryo stage to that of a "finished" athlete. The doctrine of a coach must always be "first the athlete, then the victory". All great champions have stressed at one point in their career that their favorite memories are not of winning but of the long months of preparation, the effort made before and after the competition. The dream of victory can sometimes be a source of greater joy than actually winning. A coach who is successful is one who has produced a new man - an athlete - aware of his talent and his capacity but which were badly handled. The athlete is grateful to his coach for giving him inspiration and courage and for helping him despite discouragements. The coach knows both sport and athlete in depth: he thinks, acts, breathes and speaks sport. Medicine, psychology, technique, administration, physiology, public relations, equipment, laws and responsibilities - these are all areas within the scope of knowledge of a good coach. An efficient coach will never be indifferent, but always involved. Hidden behind a great athlete there has been, is and will be a great coach. (Espagnac, 1987, p. 657)

The coach must use every tool and means available in order to mold the athlete. These tools take many forms, and because they come in different forms, a variety of tools exist for administrators and coaches. These are used to teach and train athletes and evaluate and assess programs and personnel. Some of the tools are great in theory but impractical in application. The behavioral questionnaire and leadership survey rank high in practicality and usefulness. Cratty (1981) wrote that the use of objective tools used to study and classify coaching behaviors and the increasing number of studies conducted in natural settings show promise. He suggests that such studies "indicate that not only may coaching behaviors be changed in positive ways, but that these

changes reflect how they are perceived by the (athletes) they coach." (p. 238) Cratty also credits the use of behavioral studies for helping coaches increase the self-esteem of their athletes.

Research into these behavioral tools was the direction taken by this investigator.

#### Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine if there are any differences in leadership behavior between male and female coaches of women's intercollegiate softball as perceived by the athletes.

#### Statement of the Hypothesis

There are no significant differences in leadership behavior between men and women who coached women's softball at the collegiate level.

#### Scope of the Study

This study was limited to the 212 female softball athletes in the fourteen college and university programs which agreed to participate in the study.

#### Significance of the Study

Coaches are not judged ordinarily on their leadership qualities, but on their seasonal records.

These data are not sufficient to provide real direction in improving athletic programs. More needs to be done in the area of studying coaching behaviors. Danielson (1974) observed that many investigators stressed the need for more research in "the domain of leadership and personality in coaching" as well as for more information on coaching personality and behavior that may "result in new effective practices in athletics." (p. 323) He cited an observation by Percival that called for "further work assessing athlete's perceptions of their coaches' mannerisms and methods." (p. 323)

Leadership is an important facet of every group or organization that consists of people striving to attain a common goal. This has created a great need for investigations of leadership in its various forms and its varied environments. Chelladurai (1984) wrote that "Leadership is perhaps one of the most extensively studied topics in industrial and organizational psychology." (p. 27) He observed that there were many leadership theories and models being studied and proposed. One of his lamentations was that too few studies of leadership in athletic settings could be found.

It is unfortunate and surprising that there has not been a more concerted effort to study the effects of leadership on athletic performance. Athletic teams are important organizations in their own right and provide a natural and yet manageable setting for organizational research (Ball, 1975). Further, any insight gained regarding leadership in

athletics also may be profitably used in other settings. Finally, the uniqueness of athletic teams is exemplified, among other things, by the almost total control and influence that the coach (the leader) exerts on athletes. The anecdotal accounts of the exploits of great coaches suggest that the field is rich with questions and opportunities for scientific inquiry. (Chelladurai, 1984, p. 27)

Through reviews of similar studies, as well as findings from this one, it is hoped that a better understanding of the intricacies of coaching, and especially of coaching women athletes, may develop. With greater understanding comes the opportunity to create better coaches. Better coaching should result in an observed improvement in the athletes they coach. Since athletes are the reason coaches (and athletics) exist, these same athletes should play a major role in providing data on the effectiveness of their coaches. Some may question the suggestion that athletes take an active part in this evaluation process. Others note that such participation is necessary. Cratty (1981) stated that since school presidents were assessed by their faculty and business managers were assessed by their employees, it only followed that athletes would be asked to "evaluate qualities of their coaches which they thought helpful and harmful to their performance." (p. 244) He continued by suggesting that the lack of such data seems to "reflect directions in which further research might be helpful" and the use of which may "offer helpful guidelines that may aid coaches to become more effective in their jobs." (p. 244)

This study affords athletes a chance to critically review their coaches. Such reviews are vital in order to provide opportunities for improvement in athletics. Some researchers have made the observation that athlete participation in the review process is important. Wisnieski (1980) cited work by LaGrand which supports this contention.

The athletes, in this case, are quite important because, as LaGrand (1970) pointed out: 'In order to investigate the circumstances which pervade the successful athlete-coach relationship, and thereby provide insight into the kinds of behavior these successful professionals engage in, it seemed important to examine the judgements of athletes who are in a key position for providing useful information.' (Wisnieski, 1980, p. 6)

It is hoped that the respondents gained greater evaluative insights toward the coaching process. By so doing, increased avenues of communication may have been opened, through which increased cognitive, affective, and physical learning could take place. Participation in this type of research could also serve as a means by which coaches could evaluate their own performance in a quick and easy manner. Rather than wait for competitive failures by athletes to signal inefficiencies or personality conflicts to explode between two or more people, the regular or systematic use of such questionnaires or surveys may prove to be of invaluable assistance to coaches and athletic administrators. Alexander (1986) insisted that "evaluations of coaching personnel are as necessary in the education circles as

classroom teacher and administrator evaluations." (p.1)  
Evaluative surveys and questionnaires provide avenues of education and training for coaches. Education and training provide insight into new techniques and opportunities for evaluation. Evaluation provides a form of feedback. Counselors value feedback for the growth it can encourage. The greater the quality (not quantity) of feedback received, the greater the opportunity for growth and improvement. (Corey and Corey, 1987) Improvement is one of the goals of athletics. Coaching education or training programs are often based on behavioral assessment and change. One such example is that of the Coaching Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) designed by Smith, Smoll and Hunt in 1977 and reported by one source.

The findings of the study indicated that a training program can have a positive influence on coaching behaviors. Although there was no significant difference between the number of games won or lost by the trained versus the untrained coaches, the players under a trained coach evaluated both the coach and the team climate more favorably. Trained coaches were perceived by their players as more reinforcing, more encouraging, more technically instructive, and less punitive. Of perhaps even more significance was the finding that children with low self-esteem showed the largest difference in terms of positive attitudes toward trained versus untrained coaches. They also perceived the largest difference between trained and untrained coaches along the behavioral dimensions of mistake-contingent encouragement, punishment, and general technical instruction. (Bird and Cripe, 1986, p. 301)

Assessing behavior through questionnaires, such as those reviewed and used in this study, was not intended to be the sole means to an end. The results of the



questionnaires merely provided necessary data for assessment to take place. It is the responsibility of the coach to obtain these data, analyze them, and then use this analysis to make whatever changes may be necessary. This is not to imply that there are always changes that need to be made. Some data may point out progress made in a program. Some data may show coaches where they stand with their athletes. Some data may show where their programs are weak or strong. Evaluations may even point out a potential crisis that might be more easily avoided than cured. Bird and Cripe (1986) reported that the use of questionnaires could indicate the level of satisfaction athletes have in their leaders and could even indicate sources of any dissatisfaction present.

Why should behaviors be measured? What can behavioral measurements reveal? Are there any useful data that can be derived from routinely using behavioral measurement tools? It has been shown that "Studies of this nature have contributed immensely to the profession's knowledge of student behavior, teacher behavior, and the learning climate in the gymnasium." (Lombardo and Cheffers, 1983, p. 33) Instruments designed to measure behavior contribute to student learning, teacher effectiveness, and interactions between students and teachers. (Phillips and Carlisle, 1983) They have been "effective in instrumenting desired changes in their (teachers') instructional behaviors."

(Cicciarella and Martinek, 1982, p. 56) Silva and Weinberg (1985) cited that Smoll and Smith, using their CBAS program, demonstrated the potential importance of increasing coaches' awareness of how they behave, a key to changing their behaviors. There seems to be a wealth of data that behavioral measurements can provide to the profession. If these investigators have found such instruments to be of value in educational circles, then what can be said for their importance to coaches and their behavior in athletics and the measuring of this behavior? Will this shed any more light on the role of the coach?

What is the role of the coach in athletics? Smoll and Smith (1978) perceive the role of the coach as follows:

In terms of the overall impact on the child, the coaches' role in teaching skills and techniques relevant to the sport in question may not be as crucial as the type of relationship that is formed with the players. The coach-player relationship is a social interaction, and like all such interactions, the responses of one person influence the responses of the other. In addition to giving technical instruction, coaches may be important adult models for transmitting attitudes and behaviors to their players. They also employ a variety of response-contingent behaviors that are rewarding or punitive in nature, and therefore should shape the behavior of young players. (Smoll and Smith, 1978, p. 174)

The importance of coaches to athletes, and thus coaching behaviors to athletes, has been shown here to hold a significant priority in the development of the athlete's growth and training. The studies showing trained coaches as providing positive influences on their

athletes and programs also indicate a need for studying coaching behaviors as well as for their identification and measurement. Can these behaviors be taught to present and future coaches? Cox (1985) summarized a collection of research dealing with coaching behaviors by concluding that "desirable coaching behaviors can be identified and conveyed." (p. 314) He determined that desirable behaviors could be taught to present and future coaches which could "result in better coaching and more desirable sport environments for young athletes." (p. 314)

Iso-Ahola and Hatfield (1986) put it another way. "The universal behavior theory of leadership posits that anyone can learn to be an effective coach once they learn the behaviors engaged in by such effective leaders." (p. 230) It might also appear that learning effective behaviors is necessary in light of research cited by Cox (1985) who indicated that past research in the area of coach-athlete interactions suggests there is room for improvement in this relationship.

It is often taken for granted that the goal of athletics is to produce the best end result possible, whether that be in terms of excellence of record or excellence of athletic performance. If this is the assumption, then it could also be assumed that the goal of a coach should be to provide the best, most efficient management of skills, materials, and forces at his

disposal. A predominant question seems to be how to accomplish this. Becoming an effective coach requires analysis of many factors. Behavior is just one of these factors. Just as in curriculum designs, an action plan of some type is needed by the coach.

The coach who hopes best to lead a team, and earn the respect of athletes, is one who carefully analyzes the forces present in the situation and in the group relative to their needs to be dependent or independent. Also helpful, (sic) is for the coach to analyze his or her own need for control, and the capacity to give or receive affection and socialization. Following this type of analysis the coach should then formulate a plan of action, taking into account these forces. Further complicating the problem for devising a behavioral plan of action are the changes which have been referred (sic) to; changes in the needs of athletes, and most complicated of all, changes in the social and group forces found within a team from month to month and from year to year. (Cratty, 1984, p. 163)

Since coaches are involved in men's and women's athletic programs, it is important to review and understand what it means and takes to be a coach. It is a complex, multidimensional position. When the coaching profession is studied through behavioral measurements, it is important to establish what the various dimensions of coaching are since these dimensions, and how they are handled or approached, determine the resultant coaching behaviors. It is only when the coach at the top of the 'coach-athlete hierarchy' becomes more aware, better informed, more readily accessible, and more willing to work toward self-improvement will the athletic programs in this country reflect that improvement. Investigators continue to provide a means to discover the best and

worst in athletics. This is true in all areas of athletics from physiology to psychology. Such investigations are necessary to achieve the best end result possible, both now and tomorrow. Smoll and Smith (1978) advocated that the future of sport psychology depends on "soundly designed empirical investigations" as well as "development and testing of theoretical frameworks and models that can serve as a source of testable hypotheses." (p. 4)

The researchers can carry out studies, but until coaches follow through by the incorporating the results into their athletic programs, improvement will be slow.

It is hoped that this study will open new avenues of research and broaden the base of knowledge in coaching women's intercollegiate sports. The data may help provide guidance concerning how to improve coaching skills, perceptions, and preparation.

## CHAPTER II

### RELATED LITERATURE

The review of related literature involved the search for definitions of leadership as perceived by past investigators as well as a study of the various models of leadership that have been proposed. These definitions and models were then applied to the coach as leadership studies of athletics were reviewed.

#### Leadership

Studies of leadership have been in existence for centuries. Some of the oldest descriptions of leaders and leadership can be found in religious texts such as the Bible (Numbers 11: 16-17, and Proverbs 29:2), The Book of Mormon (Jarom 1:7), the Koran (Surah 2:247-249), the Acalects of Confucius (Book VIII, verse 3), the Tao Teh Ching (Chapter 33, verses 1-3), and the Dhammapada of Buddha (Chapter XII, verses 2-5). All described the leaders of their societies. They listed the characteristics that these people possessed which made them leaders. They did not make indepth studies of leadership as a means to train others as leaders. It has been only since the earlier part of this century that leadership has been researched in such a scientific way. (Stogdill, 1974) The purpose of these first studies was

to locate one single concept which would explain successful leadership. Eventually, the investigators reflected the many dimensions involved in leadership. Hollander (1964) listed four objectives that these earlier studies held concerning leadership. The first was to look for some universality of characteristics of leaders. The second was concerned with the level of popularity of the leader who emerged from the group. The third focused on situations or circumstances that determined who would become a leader. The fourth involved the interaction between followers and leaders and the interplay between their motives and perceptions.

Major researchers in the field of leadership have been Cattell, Gibb, Hemphill, Coons, Fiedler, Likert, Halpin, Croft, Brown, Wall, and Stogdill. (Stogdill, 1974) These researchers did much of their work on industrial, military, and educational models, but all could find similarities among the qualities of leadership behavior in each group. One of the first steps necessary in any study of leadership is for the researcher to provide a definition for this term. Each author provided his own preferred definition of leadership making the selection of a single definition more difficult. Cratty (1981) remarked that "innumerable definitions of leadership have been proposed." (p. 233) He quoted Fiedler, who had observed that "...there were almost as many theories of leadership as there are psychologists

working in the field." (p. 223) Fiedler described leadership as a type of influence.

Leadership is an interpersonal relation in which power and influence are unevenly distributed so that one person is able to direct and control the actions and behaviors of others to a greater extent than they direct and control his. In such a relationship between the leader and his members, the personality of the leader is likely to determine to a large extent the degree to which he can influence the behavior of his group (Fiedler, 1967, p. 11)

Fiedler noted the complexity of defining the term. In some respects, this reflected the complicated nature of leadership itself. Is leadership a function of the person and his personality, a superficial act that is performed, or some type of influence possessed by the person? Is leadership synonymous with supervision or is it a distinctly different function? Hall et al. (1973) referred to remarks made by Roger Bellows that clarify this distinction.

We see a large difference between leadership and supervision. Leadership is planning and arranging the situations so that the group goes forward in a shared direction to the satisfaction and benefit of all concerned. Supervision is something less than this: it is merely the act of relaying directions from above and seeing that the slaves do the work. It is a difference between participative style, which is creative leadership, and the autocratic style, which is merely execution, administration, management, or supervision. (Hall et al., 1973, p. 53)

As Fiedler (1967) had found, definition of the term is complicated by the complicated nature of leadership. This nature creates confusion, not only about a singular definition of leadership, but in the subtleties between terms used within definitions. Being as specific as



possible in terminology will reduce the scope of the definition and hopefully result in a reduction in the confusion. In one of the earliest studies of leadership conducted in this century, Lewin and Lippit (1938) tried to simplify the term as much as possible. It could be said that they factored leadership into its two prime components: style and behavior.

It is important, first of all, that we clearly distinguish between leadership style and leadership behavior. By leadership behavior we generally mean the particular acts in which a leader engages in the course of directing and coordinating the work of his group members. This may involve such acts as structuring the work relations, praising or criticizing group members, and showing consideration for their welfare and feelings. Leadership style will be defined here as the underlying need-structure of the individual which motivates his behavior in various leadership situations. Leadership style thus refers to the consistency of goals or needs over different situations. Important leadership behaviors of the same individual differ from situation to situation, while the need-structure which motivates these behaviors may be seen as constant. (Lewin and Lippitt, 1938, p. 275)

Thus, it is seen that leadership style remains constant and only leadership behavior can undergo change. This narrows the search for a definition of leadership to that of leadership behavior. For the purpose of this study, Stogdill's definition of leadership behavior is used:

Leadership behaviors are any behaviors of an individual while involved in directing and coordinating the work of his group members and may involve such acts as structuring the work relations, praising or criticizing group members, and showing consideration for their welfare and feelings. (Stogdill, 1974, p. 10)

If leadership behaviors can undergo change, this change can be measured. These measurements can provide an initial baseline. From there, improvement or deterioration can be seen. By measuring these behaviors and showing how they can be improved through training and understanding, investigators have sought to provide those in athletics with a better understanding of leadership. With a better understanding of leadership, better leaders should follow.

### Leadership Theories

The various aspects of measuring leadership have helped to produce several theories concerning what makes a good leader. Some leadership theories that have been proposed and studied over the years include: The Great Man Theory, The Path-Goal Theory, The Informal versus Formal Theory, The Leader-Environment-Follower Interaction (LEFI) Theory, The Universal Traits verses Situational Traits Theory, McGregor's Theory X and Y, The PM Theory, Fiedler's Contingency Model Theory, and Chelladurai's Multidimensional Model of Leadership Theory. Each of these theories presents a unique view of the leader, leadership behaviors, and interactions with followers. What exactly are theories and how do theories relate to people? The Coreys discussed in detail how people and theories relate to each other.

A theory is not something divorced from the essence of the person; at best, it is an integral part of the person and an expression of the person's uniqueness. It is unrealistic to expect group leaders in training

to have integrated a well-defined theoretical model with their practice. This may take years of extensive reading and practice in leading groups. Developing a personalized group model that guides one's practice is obviously an ongoing process; the model continuously undergoes revision. With increased experience the leader develops new questions. Experiments are tried and clinical hunches put to the test. By talking to fellow group leaders, leaders can get ideas for modifying old practices to fit new knowledge. Good group leaders constantly question their mode of operation and make changes over time. (Corey and Corey, 1987, p. 8)

The ability to maintain an open mind about the different approaches to leadership may be a valuable asset. The Coreys continued as follows:

We are sometimes asked to declare what theory we follow. Neither of us subscribes to any single theory in totality. Rather, we function within an eclectic framework that we continue to develop as we practice. We respect the contributions that many theorists have made to the field. We freely borrow concepts and techniques from most of the contemporary therapeutic models and adapt them to our unique personalities. Thus, our theoretical orientations and leadership styles are primarily a function of the individuals we are. (Corey and Corey, 1987, p. 5)

Inflexibility seems to be an unfavorable attribute as far as deciding on the best leadership behaviors to pursue and use. If the better course is to select a mixture of the best each theory has to offer, then it would seem worthwhile to evaluate each theory and decide how to utilize its concepts.

The first concepts about leadership centered around the great men of power and prestige that are recorded in historical records. Early theorists thought that by studying these great men, an identifiable group of specific traits could be discovered that would unlock

what it was that made these people great. This effort was labeled the 'Great Man' theory of leadership. It contended that great leaders possessed superior personality characteristics which separated them from mediocre men. (Bird and Cripe, 1986) To this end, the popular belief was that leaders are "born and not made." It was assumed that these particular individuals "had inherited traits necessary for leadership, and developed the ability to lead from intuition and experience." (Kemp, 1977, p. 16) This theory gained favor in the 1920's, when personality tests were developed, and lasted until the end of World War II. The adherents of the theory felt that, since personality traits are relatively stable, potential leaders would simply be identified by the administration of a personality inventory test. (Cox, 1985) There have been many leaders in athletics. Classic names, such as Rockne, Wooden and Lombardi, rise to the top of conversations concerning great leaders in sports. Those coaches were idolized and imitated by many who hoped to duplicate their successes. They seemed to give credence to the Great Man Theory. However, the flaw in the theory came when a 'Great Man' moved from one situation to another and failed to produce the same results in the new surroundings. This indicated that there was a situational aspect to leadership. Cox (1985) suggested that "certain traits may lead to effective leadership in certain situations." (p.305)

He recommended that further investigation into the relationship between leadership traits and specific situations be done.

Proponents of the Universal Trait verses Situational Trait Leadership Theory contended that it was no longer logical to search for identifiable universal leadership traits, but rather to look at traits that were common in people in specific situations. Several investigators looked at successful leadership situations in an attempt to identify common personality traits, both positive and negative, found in specific situations. According to Cox (1985), "while there may not be a universal set of traits associated with successful leadership," it was possible that "certain combinations of traits might...be beneficial in certain situations." (p. 306)

Hile (1985) noted that coaching decisions are based on a multitude of alternatives that are present in every situation. The coach will respond, therefore, in any variety of ways depending upon his leadership style.

It seemed that neither the Great Man Theory nor the Universal/Situational Trait Theory could provide the answers in every case. There were too many exceptions to the rule. The discrepancies of the Great Man and the Universal/Situational Traits theories resulted in the appearance of Fiedler's Contingency Theory. This is a form of the Situational Trait Leadership Theory, which acknowledged that leadership was too complex to be

enclosed in one black-and-white concept.

The contingency approach to leadership suggests that leader effectiveness is somehow situation specific, and that leader behaviors that are effective in one situation may not be in another. In a sense, effective leadership depends upon specific environmental situations. (Cox, 1985, p. 314)

As situational theories, such as Fiedler's, began to be developed another concept was gaining momentum. This concept moved the emphasis of leadership away from the leader or situation and toward a group. This came to be known as the Path-Goal Theory of leadership. This theory placed its emphasis on the needs and the goals of the group rather than the leader. The leader is more of a 'facilitator' who helps the subordinates reach or realize their goals. The leader becomes more the 'selfless one' who exists solely for the good of the group. Cox presented that view succinctly:

The leader's success is viewed in terms of whether or not the subordinates achieve their goals. Thus, the basic proposition of the path-goal theory is that the function of the leader is to provide a 'well-lighted path' to assist the follower in achieving goals. (Cox, 1985, p. 319)

This could be interpreted to mean that the best coach (leader) is the "winningest" one. It could also be conveyed to mean that the best coach is the one who helps each individual athlete achieve his or her own personal goals in athletic and life pursuits. This is the premise of the American Coaching Effectiveness Program started by Rainer Martens. (Martens, 1987) This program teaches the

coach to place the athlete first and winning second. This concept seems to be more in line with Whitman's poetic proposal. The coach becomes the resource person or 'facilitator' rather than the 'iron-fisted' ruler of the group.

The leader must analyze the situation in order to identify variables to which he needs to respond. The term 'facilitator' well describes the leader or coach in the Path-Goal Theory. According to Egan:

The leader is usually called a 'trainer' or 'facilitator' and acts, ideally, both as a model and a resource person for the group rather than as an authoritarian figure. He models the kinds of behavior that help members achieve the stipulated goals of the group. He also facilitates the examination and understanding of the experiences of the group. He helps participants focus on the way the group is working (or not working), the style of each individual's participation (or non-participation) and the issues that are facing the group (or that the group is not facing). (Egan, 1973, p. 11)

A variation of Situational or Path-Goal theories evolved into the Leader-Environment-Follower Interaction Theory of leadership. The Leader-Environment-Follower Interaction (LEFI) Theory of leadership contends that the effective leader is one who analyzes those deficiencies in the follower's ability, motivation, role perception, and work environment which inhibit performance, and then takes action to eliminate these deficiencies. Wofford and Srinivasan (1983) stated that, "The LEFI theory accepts the basic position of House (1971) that the most appropriate perspective for examining leader

effectiveness is in terms of the leader's impact upon the follower's performance." (p. 35) This theory more closely related success to the number of successful individuals over whom a coach has had influence. It breaks leadership success into individual terms rather than group terms. This, too, seems to closely resemble the thoughts of Walt Whitman. The LEFI theory appears to reverse the contention that there is no "I" in "team." Instead, it reduces the team to its smallest components - individuals.

The simplest of the leadership theories may be the Informal versus Formal theory which places the determination of leadership on the method of initial application. This theory is concerned with how the group came to accept the leader. According to Hollander:

The acceptance of influence, which is conditional upon the consent of followers, produces 'emergent' leadership. 'Imposed' leadership tends to be determined by superior authority. 'Informal' leadership is an emergence form of leadership, while 'formal' leadership is imposed upon the group." (Hollander, 1964, p. 6)

Imposed leadership describes the situation where a coach claims leadership authority due to his appointment to the post by a principal or athletic director. Formal leadership implies the coach is the leader because he or some higher authority says so. Informal leadership has been delegated to the coach by the followers based on their respect of the coach's abilities and characteristics.



These resemble the authoritarian or autocratic versus democratic forms of leadership. In the authoritarian and autocratic forms, "authority comes from above without the consent of those governed." (Hall et al., 1973, p. 8) The tenants of the democratic (informal) form are rule by the majority with the advocacy of the greatest good for the greatest number and the recognition of the personal dignity of all those involved. (Hall et al., 1973)

McGregor's Theory of X and Y is a complex leadership theory based on the concept that leaders should be employee--or athlete--oriented. Cox describes the theory in the following quotation:

According to McGregor, one must adopt either a Theory X or a Theory Y approach to leadership. In Theory Y, the employee is perceived as being self-motivated and responsible, while in Theory X the employee is considered lazy and irresponsible. According to Likert (1961) and McGregor (1960), if one believes Theory Y and rejects Theory X, then it logically follows that a human relations approach to management and leadership is the only viable alternative. (Cox, 1985, p. 310)

The coach who follows this concept would either believe that athletes are capable of thinking and acting on their own initiative with little input from the coach or that athletes are sheep requiring constant attention in order to achieve results.

In the PM Leadership Type Theory, P and M behaviors are the base on which leadership is developed. This concept was developed in Japan as a result of studies done at the University of Michigan and The Ohio State

University. (Misumi, 1985)

The FM concept centers around the idea of basic group functions. Numerous studies of small groups and hierarchical organizations indicate that group functions can be broadly divided into two components. One is the function of contributing toward a group's goal achievement or problem solving, and the other is that of promoting and strengthening the group process itself. The problem-solving or goal achievement function may be referred to as P, for performance, and the self-preservation function may be referred to as M, for maintenance. These functions can be either positive or negative in scope. Negative P leadership is leadership that moves a group in a direction away from the desirable outcome while negative M leadership is leadership that reduces the social stability of a group. (Misumi, 1985, p. 9)

The final concept to be reviewed is that of Chelladurai's Multidimensional Model of Leadership. This model reviews the positive and negative aspects of three scales and, based on how these positives and negatives are combined, describes the type of leadership along one of four basic outcomes.

In this model, athlete satisfaction and performance are viewed as the products of the interaction of three components of leadership: prescribed leader behavior, preferred leader behavior, and actual leader behavior. Prescribed leader behaviors are those that conform to the established norms of the organization. Preferred leader behaviors are those behaviors that are preferred by the athletes. Finally, actual leader behaviors are those behaviors that the leader exhibits irrespective of the norms or preferences of the team. When there is congruence between all three types of leader behavior, the outcome should be ideal in terms of performance and satisfaction. A laissez-faire outcome is predicted when all three leader behaviors are incongruent with each other. (Cox, 1985, p. 330)

Chelladurai implies that the coach is really three people. The person he sees as himself, the person as

others see him, and the person he really is.

Combinations of these three perceptions multiplied by the varying levels of intensity to which these perceptions are received help to precipitate reactions in the leader and the followers that produce outcomes in interpersonal interactions. A person's ability to control this mixture of perceptions determines the consequence and the outcome in each situation.

It is important to study leadership theories in order to gain insight into why leaders (coaches) act and react as they do. The theories encompass the thought processes involved. The study of leadership theories allows both leaders and followers to gain a basic understanding of leadership and to provide mutual input into the selection and form of leadership they desire to practice.

#### Characteristics of the Coach

Each leadership theory has an interactional component. This component involves the leader, follower and situation in some combination and with varying degrees of intensity or importance. In athletics, each person must view these theories in totality, keeping suggested coaching characteristics in mind, to determine how well they may fit into each person's unique life/task situation.

The significance of being able to apply leadership behavior studies to athletics and coaching lies in the

importance of the relationship between the athlete and the coach and the role of the coach as perceived by the athlete. Coaches should not be judged solely on apparent leadership qualities, but on their ability to apply these qualities and interact with their athletes in order to provide for emotional, cognitive and affective needs as well as physical needs. Neal recognized that:

The good coach does not just happen. He or she must want to be a coach, and must be trained as one. A good coach should: (1) understand the workings of the human body, (2) know the best and most up-to-date methods for training and conditioning athletes, (3) have the ability to analyze and correct form, (4) have insight about how to best use personnel, (5) believe in the values of competition, (6) be aware of opportunities for personality development in sports, (7) have the qualities of dedication, enthusiasm, and initiative, (8) be capable of selflessness, (9) understand psychology, and (10) have a sense of responsibility to players and public. (Neal, 1978, p. 5)

In searching for all of the qualities that are necessary to be a good coach and a successful leader, it must be remembered that each individual has been given certain qualities that must be used to this end. It is not always possible to study other people's programs and achieve the same ends as they did. Unfortunately, what may work for one person cannot always be successfully applied to another. Still, as long as studies are made that compare athletic styles and programs, there will be the possibility of finding a new and valuable source for improvement. This must be, since all knowledge is not inherent in any one individual and the pool of knowledge increases with improvement in technology. In order to

keep up with this increase in knowledge and technology in athletics, research must be done and professionals in the field of athletics must put the results into practice.

The purpose of comparative studies was not so much to enable one coach to look at another program and try to imitate it, as to provide resource materials from which coaches could draw in preparing themselves to provide the very best in their programs.

Wardell (1977) noted that despite efforts by some less successful coaches to copy the leadership style of a more successful coach, the results were often more negative "than if the losing coach had maintained his own original leadership style." (p. 1)

It is this leader-follower or coach-athlete relationship that is the heart of any athletic program. It is a typical dyad where one party holds great influence and power over the other party. While the maintenance of a delicate balance is not altogether necessary, the fact that it is a dynamic relationship requiring constant monitoring and evaluation must be kept in mind.

LaGrand (1973) observed that "the relationship between player and coach or student and teacher has long been recognized as the key to success or failure, winning or losing, learning or wasting precious time." (p. 92) He continued by noting there was very little literature available that concerned itself with athlete's

perceptions about coaches. He thought this to be an oversight since "they (athletes) are the closest to the coaches and see them in their most trying situations." (p. 92)

The production or use of lists of "ideal" coaching characteristics has been a primary purpose of many studies. This was done in order to provide an inventory list that coaches may use to critique themselves. Some investigations have involved the polling of athletes. LaGrand (1973) used this approach. He polled 314 athletes asking them to rate their best ever coach. The results yielded fourteen specific characteristics. These included: (1) knowledge of the sport, (2) enthusiasm, (3) willingness to help, (4) demands for hard work, (5) interest in player, (6) ability to organize, (7) methods of teaching, (8) ability for personal demonstration, (9) ability to inspire, (10) understanding of the player as an individual, (11) use of discipline, (12) personal appearance, (13) use of humor, (14) interest in player's outside activities, (p. 92)

Other investigators surveyed the coaches themselves to determine what their perceptions of ideal coaching behavior and characteristics were. Some investigators examined the coach in action and reported whatever behaviors or practices were observed being used. Cratty (1981) wrote that certain coaching behaviors could impede the adoption of new techniques by coaches.

Loy (1968) found that the more sociable, flexible, intelligent, and self-sufficient female coaches tended to adopt the practice earlier than did those who did not possess these qualities to the same degree. Overall, the more than 100 male and female coaches from whom data were collected, and who were labeled 'early innovators' were found to be more creative, cosmopolitan, and higher in professional and educational status than those who did not quickly adopt the new and helpful practice. These data thus suggest that extreme rigidity and inflexibility in the behavior of at least some coaches may serve as an impediment to the adoption of new coaching practices. (Cratty, 1981, p. 237)

It is also necessary to take the situational aspects of coaching into account as far as the sport or type of sport involved. This may determine the type of leadership behaviors that athletes prefer or that coaches need to exhibit. It must be remembered that individuals are coached just as individuals coach. While not always practical, theoretically a coach should have a separate coaching plan for each individual athlete. This plan would be based on that athlete's needs, personality, experience, and goals.

The coach's behavior is a function of his/her own personal characteristics (personality, ability, experience, etc.) as well as the influences of the situations in which he/she operates.

Since both the athlete and the coach operate in the same environment, it can influence the coach as well as the athlete. It was found that within interdependent sports (basketball, football, hockey, and volleyball), successful coaches were perceived to be higher on coordinating, exercising their leadership role, and emphasizing production than were the coaches of losing teams. Within the independent sports (swimming, track and field, golf, wrestling), however, successful coaches were perceived to be more concerned with maintaining a closely knit group and resolving conflicts than were unsuccessful coaches. Furthermore, successful coaches in interdependent sports, as compared to successful coaches in

independent sports, were perceived as displaying more role clarification, integrating group function, exercising leadership role, and placing greater emphasis on production. These coaches also showed less tolerance for athletes' freedom and less concern for their comfort and well-being. (Silva and Weinberg, 1984, p. 335)

Since each decision made by the coaches will be in response to a set of circumstances in a given situation, their particular leadership style will direct what this decision will be. It is important for the coach to be his/her own person when directing his/her team's efforts. (Hile, 1985) Behaviors identify types of leadership. The coach must learn what these behaviors are and monitor them in order to be the most effective leader for the team.

Measurement of coaching (leadership) behaviors can provide much data for researchers. Many instruments exist for gathering data about various forms of leadership in various situations and environments. These instruments were reviewed thoroughly.

#### Measurement of Behaviors

##### Types of Instruments

Various instruments have been used to identify and measure behavioral characteristics. Each instrument was developed to meet and measure certain criteria. These criteria were based on the researcher's concepts of behavior or leadership. Hill (1978) discussed a few of the problems this has created.

There were several broad areas which have been investigated. One prevalent area of investigation



has been the identification of the personality traits of a variety of sports participants, both team and individual sports. Results of some of the studies by Kane and Callaghan (1966), Lakie (1962), Johnson (1972), Gold (1955), Kroll and Carlson (1967), Booth (1958), Bosco (1962), Flanagan (1951), Malumphy (1968), Knapp (1965), and Peterson et al. (1967) were, for the most part, contradictory and inconclusive. A partial reason for such contradictory results has been attributed to two factors. The first was a variety of instruments used. Although the majority of instruments used measured stable traits, each instrument measured traits which were not always comparable across instruments. The second factor which has caused contradictory results has been the differing skill levels and variance in the athlete populations that were used. (Hill, 1978)

A list of the variety of instruments employed and the researchers using them include: The Emotionality, Activity, Sociability and Impulsivity III (EASI III) Survey (Hill 1978); Critical Incident Survey Technique (Jones 1975); the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B) Scale (Carron and Bennett (1977) and Horne and Carron (1985)); the Youth Self Description Questionnaire (Stein 1979); Cattell's 16 Personality Factor (Cattell's 16 pf) Questionnaire (Gates (1972), Hendry (1969) and Nelson (1966)); the Osgood Semantic Differential (Clark (1974), LaGrand (1970) and Evans (1978)); the Likert Scale (Steinbrecher et al. (1978) and Tamsberg (1978)); the Lease Preferred Co-Worker (LPC) Scale (Wardell (1977), Lewis (1978) and Young (1981)); the Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS) (Hile (1985), Schliesman (1987) and Chelladurai and Saleh (1980)); the Leadership Potential Inventory (LPI) used by

Dua (cited by Walter, 1968); the Flanders' Interaction Analysis System (FIAS) (Flanders 1970); The Cheffers Adaptation of the Flanders' Interaction Analysis System (CAFIAS) created by Lombardo et al. (1983); The Dyadic Adaptation of the Cheffers Adaptation of the Flanders' Interaction Analysis System (DAC) produced by Cicciarella et al. (1982); the Mach Scale used by Sage (cited by Iso-Ahola and Hatfield 1986); the Coach Behavior Description Questionnaire (CBDQ) by Danielson (1974); the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) by Rath (1983), Kemp (1977) and Wisnieski (1980); and other types of questionnaires such as those used by Brandt and Elam (1987), Booth (1958) and Alexander (1986). The variety of surveys, survey techniques, administration methods, subjects and conclusions can pose a dilemma for those studying leadership behaviors in the athletics arena. It may help to observe the use of some of the instruments in different environments before viewing their use in athletics.

#### Types of Environments Studied

Some areas where leadership studies have been done include the fields of business, education and athletics. (Stogdill, 1974) There are no restrictions on environments or situations where such tools may be used, just as there are no restrictions as to where leaders or leadership behaviors may be found. Several researchers have used investigative tools to identify and measure

leader behaviors in education. Twenty-one studies of leadership within the academic ranks have been found in the literature. The instruments used in these twenty-one studies measured the specific behaviors and characteristics targeted by the researchers.

Educational leadership research includes investigation of physical education departments or deans of community colleges (D. Buckiewicz (1974) and Cox (1973)), teaching behaviors at various levels of education (Daniel (1983), Walter (1986), Smith and Lutz (1964), Brown (1980), Lombardo et al. (1983), Phillips et al. (1983), and Mancini et al. (1980)), physical education administrators at various educational levels (Lumley (1971), Kemp (1977), Palmer (1982), Milner (1976), Waldenberger (1975), Meyer (1984), and Johnson (1982)), deans of junior colleges and law schools (Carson (1962), Verbeke (1966), and Johns (1986)), and student evaluations of physical education programs (Avery et al. (1987)).

D. Buckiewicz (1974) used the LBDO-XII to compare perceptions of community college faculty and department chairmen on twelve dimensions of leader behavior. Perceptions of the male and female faculty and the male and female leaders differed on certain leadership dimensions. The perceptions of male and female faculty with male leaders differed in the initiating structure, production emphasis, integration, persuasiveness,

consideration, and superior orientation dimensions. Male and female faculty with female leaders did not differ significantly. It was also found that leader maturity, years of administrative experience, amount of leadership educational course work, and school enrollment played roles in differences in perception.

Milner (1976) also used the LBDO to study and compare leadership behaviors of male and female heads of physical education departments in major colleges and universities. The purpose of the study was to determine if differences existed between the real and ideal leadership behavior of male and female department heads as described by themselves and by their faculties. There were no significant differences in the real initiating structure and consideration scores of male and female department heads as described by their faculties.

Kemp (1977) investigated the perceptions of 129 physical educators toward the leadership behavior of women physical education administrators in eight colleges and universities. A sixty-four item Q-sort questionnaire, based on Stogdill's concept of leader behavior, was used to survey the subjects. Scores were divided into the dimensions of consideration and initiating structure and their respective subcategories. The results indicated that there were no significant differences between subcategories of leadership, statement orientation, subcategories by statement

orientation, and subcategories by statement orientation with sex as an added factor or between orientations with sex as a main effect.

Lombardo and Cheffers (1983) observed four elementary school physical education teachers (two male and two female) twice daily over a period of twenty consecutive teaching days. Their purpose was to observe and describe the teaching behavior and interaction patterns of elementary school physical education teachers with secondary concerns dealing with the influence of the time of day of the class, the day of the week of the class, grade level of the class, and the content of the lesson on teacher behavior and interaction in the gymnasium. Observers used the Cheffers Adaptation of the Flanders' Interaction Analysis System (CAFIAS) to code and tally behaviors. One hundred and sixty individual observations were completed and 810 CAFIAS sheets were produced containing 112,054 individual tallies. The results were compared to fifty-one CAFIAS parameters to determine significant differences in behavior. Only two of the fifty-one parameters demonstrated significant fluctuation on a day-to-day basis indicating that teacher behavior remained stable over time. This showed that teachers determine a personally comfortable style of teaching and habitually behave in this manner for all groups. The variables of time of day, grade level, and day of the week of the class had a negligible influence

on the teaching behavior and interaction in the physical education classes. The content of the lesson did influence behavior and interaction as teachers varied their behavior from teaching unit to teaching unit.

Phillips and Carlisle (1983) looked at the Physical Education Teacher Assessment Instrument (PETI) as a possible method to study behavior and enhance student achievement. The PETI consists of three teacher and three student behavior categories that help determine the teacher's ability to analyze student needs, teacher's management abilities, and instruction time utilization, as well as the student's skill learning time, management time, and achievement gains. The validity and reliability of the instrument were established and data were collected on eighteen physical education teachers who instructed ten-lesson units in volleyball to fifth through eighth graders. The results indicated that use of the PETI can enhance the teacher's ability to analyze student needs and students' engaged learning skill time and achievement.

#### Questionnaire Use in Athletics

Use of the questionnaire in athletics can be a worthwhile undertaking. Questionnaires can be simple demography forms used to locate common bonds between individuals which may help to create some initial cohesion within the group. They may also point out strengths and weaknesses in a program so that they may

be, respectively, explored or expunged. Shyroock and Seigal (1972) support the use of questionnaires to obtain factual information.

At first thought, it may seem that if there is a need for information, it is only natural and logical to ask for it. In other words, if it is necessary to know what people think about certain issues or products, it may appear that the easiest and quickest way to find out is to interview people. The process of collecting information, regardless of the technique used, requires that the collector must first decide what facts he needs to obtain. These facts must be those that are necessary to the solution of the problem under study, and they must be set forth as specifically written statements which describe and explain exactly the information required. Fact finding should always be accomplished by the techniques that are most efficient in the light of the problem being investigated and the time and the financial limitations involved. (Shyroock and Siegal, 1972, p. 75)

Time and financial limitations may not allow all athletes to be interviewed concerning coaches and their behaviors. Some athletes may lack the trust necessary to fully confide deep concerns during an interview with an athletic department administrative figure. This same athlete may find the anonymity of a questionnaire a safe and effective outlet for these feelings and concerns. These disclosures could prove very valuable to an athletic program. As Wisnieski (1980) commented concerning questionnaire use:

Questionnaires measuring how leadership behavior is perceived may be completed by the leaders themselves or by other members of the group. The athletes, in this case, are quite important because, as LaGrand (1970) pointed out: "In order to investigate the circumstances which pervade the successful athlete-coach relationship, and thereby provide insight into the kinds of behavior these successful professionals

engage in, it seemed important to examine the judgements of athletes who are in a key position for providing useful information." (Wisniewski, 1980, p. 6)

Hile (1985) noted that the athletes' perceptions of their coaches' leadership behavior is "instrumental in assessing the coach's effectiveness." (pg. 29). She further observed that coaches need to acknowledge these perceptions since they cannot ignore them and "still be successful in guiding the players' performance" in competition. (pg. 29)

Once the athletes complete the questionnaire and the data have been analyzed, are the data trustworthy? Are athletes a reliable source for leadership behavior data? Misumi (1985) considered the athletes to be very reliable and noted:

Leadership research, however, has shown that questionnaire responses can reflect a considerable amount of real information about leadership. Stogdill (1969) showed a convergence between leadership behaviors shown by actors and the LBDQ descriptions of naive observers. Bales and Isenberg (1982) have found that the descriptions of leadership by naive observers converge well with observers' records. Even studies designed to show the effects of extraneous information on leadership descriptions have indicated that actual behavior is significantly and substantially reflected in questionnaire responses (Rush and Beauvais 1981). (Misumi, 1985, p. 153)

Silva and Weinberg (1984) found similar agreement of results in surveys of athletes when they observed that athletes' perceptions of leadership were more accurate than those of the coach.

Correlations between the mean behavioral



ratings of each team and the observed CBAS behaviors of the 51 coaches revealed that players most accurately perceived punitive behaviors, reactions to mistakes, and game-irrelevant communicative behaviors of the coach. However, correlations between players' perceptions of their coaches' behaviors and the coaches' self-perceptions were low and generally nonsignificant. This indicated that there was little correspondence between the way coaches viewed themselves and how their players perceived them. Indeed, the players' perceptions tended to be more accurate in that they correlated more highly with CBAS observed behavior scored. (Silva and Weinberg, 1985, p. 377)

The question could be put forth as to who are the evaluative experts in athletic leadership situations. If the athletes can handle the pressures of school and social life plus those imposed upon them by the competitive processes of athletics, could it not be considered that they are capable enough to complete a questionnaire asking about a coach with whom they are probably more intimately associated than either the athletic director or alumni? The preceding studies seem to indicate that athletes were quite accurate in their perceptions of such behaviors. Why not give these athletes the opportunity to provide this type of feedback to the coach, the administration and the program to which they devote so much of their time and effort? Athletes are quite capable of assessing their own needs within the scope of their athletic lives, and they can be as capable of determining just how well the coach provided for those needs. The key point would be for those seeking the athletes' feedback to provide a well-developed instrument administered for the purpose of competently gathering this data.

### Studies of Athletic Personnel

Numerous investigations have been done in the area of athletic leadership. The topics studied include the athletic directors, coaching personalities as related to success factors, comparison of male and female coaches, comparison of female coaches only, polls of female athletes only, and polls of athletes of specific sports.

Research concerned with athletic directors include: specific investigation of liberal arts colleges and universities (Watkins 1983); job satisfaction as a reflection of leadership behavior (Vasquez 1982); leadership behavior of voluntary administrators (Vienneau 1982); leadership attitudes of male and female athletic directors (Sunderland 1981); and comparisons between athletic directors and their coaches (F. Buckiewicz 1974).

F. Buckiewicz (1974) used the LBDO-XII to survey twenty-four athletic directors and 103 collegiate coaches. Athletic directors as a group generally perceived their leadership behavior similarly. Results showed that the coach's perception of their immediate athletic director's behavior to be very much in agreement with the estimates given by the athletic director. The type of sport coached had no significant effect on the coach's perception of the athletic director's behavior.

Watkins (1983) studies the leader behavior of

directors of athletics at eight liberal arts colleges to determine if differences existed between the leader behavior of athletic directors as described by the athletic directors themselves and their intercollegiate sport coaches, their deans, and the presidents of the colleges at which they were employed. The instrument used to assess the 'athletic directors' behavior was the Managerial Behavior Survey (MBS). Respondents included eight athletic directors, five college presidents, six college deans, and 107 sport coaches. It was found that sport coaches tended to differ from the athletic directors, college presidents, and college deans on how they perceived the leader behavior of the athletic directors.

Concerns regarding success factors in athletics are of two types. One concern is with leadership personalities, characteristics, or style hoping to find the formula for success and the other compares successful and unsuccessful programs trying to locate material differences. Those which compared leadership personality and characteristics or leadership style to the success of the program include works by Kearns (1986), Schroeder (1978), Young (1981), Lewis (1978), Patrow (1971), Hastad (1972), Helms (1980), Wardell (1977), Green (1980), Friedrichs (1984), Lacy (1983), Model (1983), Stein (1979) and Icinciong (1974). Those which concerned themselves only with comparing successful and

unsuccessful coaches and/or programs include studies by Dallman (1973), Clark (1974), Eggert (1978), Simpson (1984), and Ogilvie (1965).

In 1986, Kearns examined the relationship of leadership and personality to success in coaching collegiate women's basketball. Nineteen coaches with high winning percentages and twenty-four with low winning percentages completed both the LBDO-XII and Cattell's 16 PF questionnaires. Results showed that there was no significant difference between the two groups.

Hasted (1972) studied the relationship between authoritarianism and success in the coaching of high school football and basketball. Twenty-eight coaches (fourteen from each sport) completed a forty-eight item modified F-scale Rokeach Dogmatism questionnaire. Analysis to compare the upper one-third (the most successful coaches) with the lower two-thirds (the least successful coaches) showed there was no significant difference between the two groups. Further analysis showed no significant relationship between success and authoritarianism between the most successful group and the least successful group.

Lewis (1978) was concerned with the relationship between leadership and success of female volleyball coaches. Leadership styles of forty-eight high school coaches were measured along the lines of Fiedler's Contingency Model of leadership using the Least Preferred

Co-Worker (LPC) Scale. The effectiveness of female volleyball coaches as measured by the LPC was then correlated with team success. Results indicated that there was no significant relationship between leadership style and team success.

Dallman (1973) analyzed the differences between selected personality traits of successful and unsuccessful coaches in football, wrestling and basketball. Using Cattell's 16 PF questionnaire, coaches having more than 60 percent victories were compared to coaches having fewer than 60 percent victories. Results showed that the unsuccessful basketball coaches were slower to learn and grasp ideas than the successful group. The successful wrestling coaches were shy, diffident, and more careful in detail than the unsuccessful group who were emotionally less stable and more easily upset than the successful group. There was no significant difference found between successful and unsuccessful football coaches.

Wardell (1977) viewed the relationship between leadership style and success of male high school coaches of football, basketball, wrestling and track. Four head coaches from each of twenty-one high schools completed the Least Preferred Co-Worker (LPC) Scale. Results indicated that LPC correlated with team success and performance in the sports of football and wrestling. The relationship between the LPC and team success in

basketball and track was not significant.

Stein (1979) used the Youth Self Description questionnaire to survey ten high school girls' volleyball teams and their coaches. The purpose was to determine if any correlation existed between an athletic coach's ability to describe their athletes' perceptions of themselves in terms of Erikson's Ego State Theory and their contest success in volleyball. Analysis of the 120 item, six part like-unlike scale indicated that no significant relationship existed between the athletes' perceptions of themselves and the descriptions of this perception given by the coach.

Young (1981) investigated the relationships along leader characteristics of male and female basketball coaches and team performance. Sixty-four male and twenty-five female coaches completed both the LPC and the LBDQ, as well as undergoing a thirty-minute interview. Analysis revealed that women were more structuring than men, used fewer production emphasis behaviors, and believed that sportsmanship was more important than the men. Male coaches showed more consideration, used more production emphasis behaviors, believed winning, fitness, and aggressiveness were more important than the female coaches. The study also showed that men and women were equally effective as coaches of female athletic teams.

Research comparing the leadership behaviors of female coaches or those involved solely in the coaching

of female athletes include works by Kearns (1986), Schroeder (1978), Lewis (1978), Clay (1974), Stallard (1974), Hill (1978), Knoppers (1978), Johnson (1972), Malumphy (1968), Peterson et al. (1967), George (1988), Jerome (1969), Buhner (1973), Clark (1974), Jones (1975), Eggert (1978), Fankhauser (1978), Tamsberg (1978), Lowry (1972), Grastorf (1980), Callaway (1982), and Ortelee (1983).

Clark (1974) surveyed 419 female athletes in four sports (Basketball, volleyball, gymnastics and swimming) to ascertain their perceptions of selected characteristics of successful women intercollegiate coaches. Each athlete ranked a list of twelve coaching characteristics with their coach in mind. The results showed that, of the team sports of basketball and volleyball, basketball coaches were ranked highest on all twelve characteristics. In the individual sports of swimming and gymnastics, the swimming coaches were higher on eleven of the twelve, with gymnastics coaches scoring higher only on the talent for organizing characteristic. The individual sports coaches ranked higher overall on nine of the twelve areas with team sport coaches being higher on knowledge of sport, ability to teach and talent for organizing.

George (1988) studied 516 collegiate athletes at eleven Indiana colleges to determine their interest in a coaching career. The athletes were asked to denote the

gender of their past coaches as well as declare any gender preference of coaches. Eighty-four percent of the females had been coached by both female and male coaches. There was an even split in attitudinal preference for a male or female coach.

Jones (1975) employed the critical incident technique of on-the-scene observations of behavior to identify and classify incidents judged to be characteristic of effective and ineffective coaching of thirteen female collegiate volleyball coaches. The 133 observers reported 684 incidents which yielded 1,324 behaviors. These behaviors were placed in a classification system to create a list of the seventeen most frequently reported behaviors. These were labeled "critical behaviors." The two most important critical behaviors as determined by this study were: (1) to analyze and correct skill errors, and (2) to encourage the players and the team.

Eggert (1978) analyzed the relationship between selected factors used to prepare coaches and coaching success in women's athletics at the collegiate level. The study involved 147 female and thirty-one male coaches in the sports of basketball, volleyball, softball, golf, tennis, and gymnastics. The factors selected were age, college degree, years of experience, collegiate major, and combination of these. It was found that the most successful coaches were those who had not been physical



education majors but who had a lot of experience in athletics.

Fankhouser (1978) investigated the differences between female athletes' real and ideal perceptions of their volleyball coaches. Using the Coaches Ideal-Real Description Questionnaire, 314 female volleyball players from twenty-seven Kansas high schools were surveyed. The findings indicated a difference in some of the ideal characteristics that the athlete was expecting of the coach and those actually exhibited by the coach. The perceptions matched in the characteristic areas of ability to motivate, aggression, being an example, encouraging, energetic, ethical, cooperation, dedication, emotionally stable, development of self confidence, firmness, good appearance, honesty, knowledgeable, leadership, loyalty, optimism, perception, practical, reliable, respected, responsible, secure, humor, and understanding. The ideal perceptions did not match real perceptions in the characteristic areas of fairness, creativity, preparedness and trustworthiness.

Schroeder (1978) investigated the leader behavior of female collegiate coaches as Perceived by athletes in relation to team success. The LBDQ-Real Questionnaire was used to survey twenty-six coaches and their athletes. There was no significant relationship between the win-loss record and leader behavior as perceived by the athletes.

Tamsberg (1978) sought to identify competencies considered to be important for coaches of female athletes. Five hundred subjects were surveyed using seven-dimensional analysis in the areas of administrative aspects, kinesiological foundations, medical-legal aspects, physiological foundations, psychological aspects, sociological aspects, and theory and technique. The survey was a Likert scale which measured reflections of the degree of importance attached to the various competencies. It was concluded that the role of the coaches of female athletes was multidimensional in nature. These dimensions were divided into six categories deemed to be the most important. These were evaluative aspects, scientific applications, medical-legal aspects, value considerations, administrative aspects, and individualized training techniques.

Studies concerned with comparing the leadership behavior of males and females involved in coaching or administration of physical education included those by Nimchick (1977), Newcomb (1977), Stanek (1977), Green (1980), Hile (1985), Young (1981), Williams (1987), Johnson (1982), Heller (1978), Sunderland (1981), Williams (1982), and Butterfield and Powell (1981).

Nimchick (1977) investigated the attitudes of female collegiate swimmers toward male and female coaches. Seventy-one athletes (thirty-five coached by men and thirty-six coached by women) completed a semantic

differential questionnaire to assess their attitudes regarding six concepts. It was found that the athletes were more positive toward male coaches than female coaches regarding the coaches' authority and their willingness to put in extra time to help the swimmers. There were no significant differences on the remaining concepts.

Hile (1985) compared the leadership behavior of male and female coaches of women's collegiate basketball teams. The Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS) was used to survey twenty-nine coaches and 312 athletes from thirty-one colleges and universities in order to evaluate the coaches' behavior on five factors. These factors were training and instruction, democratic behavior, social supports, autocratic behavior, and positive feedback. The results showed that the leadership behavior of male and female coaches did not differ significantly when perceived by the athletes.

Newcomb (1977) also surveyed female athletes concerning their attitudes toward their male and female coaches. One hundred and twenty-nine female collegiate athletes were surveyed. The female athletes shared similar attitudes toward male and female coaches. Neither coach was considered a parent figure but more often a good friend. Neither coach was considered to have much influence on the athletes' personality. While the athletes had no preference as to who coached

them, they felt that the female coach created a more positive image for female athletes.

Stanek (1977) compared the interpersonal behavior characteristics of selected male and female collegiate coaches in large and small schools. She found that the size of the college affected certain types of behavior, such as expressed inclusion, with small institutions scoring higher in many areas. Sex of the coach was a factor in the areas of control and inclusion with males scoring higher than females in both.

Williams (1987) investigated the self-perceptions of leadership qualities of male and female coaches in ninety-five western Pennsylvania schools. The coaches' responses to questions on the LBDQ-XXI were analyzed to determine if there was a difference in the way male head coaches and female head coaches perceived leadership qualities in head coaches. No significant differences were found in any of the twelve subscales.

Many investigators have undertaken to study the leadership behaviors of coaches of individual sports or specific combinations of team and/or individual sports. Among the sports studied are the 'major sports' of basketball (Clark (1974), Eggert (1978), Gates (1972), LaGrand (1970), Wardell (1977), Lowry (1972), Green (1980), Hile (1985), Simpson (1984), Young (1981), Hodges (1983), Grastorf (1980), Hartman (1972), Rider (1971), Hastad (1972), Dallman (1973), Kearns (1986), Helms

(1980), Johnson (1972), Callaway (1982), Inciong (1974), Vis Strache (1979), and Chelladurai and Saleh (1980)), football (Gates (1972), Wardell (1977), Lacey (1983), Model (1983), Hastad (1972), and Dallman (1973)), baseball (Gates (1972), and Seymour (1956)), and volleyball (Clark (1974), Eggert (1978), Fankhouser (1978), Jones (1975), Stein (1979, Grastorf (1980), Rath (1983) and Lewis (1978)). Also researched were behaviors in other sports such as water polo (Gaintner (1976)), gymnastics (Clark (1974), Eggert (1978), and Bosco (1962)), hockey (Danielson et al. (1974)), swimming (Clark (1974), Nimchick (1977), Behrman (1967), Hendry (1969), and Gaintner (1976)), softball (Eggert (1978), Wisnieski (1980), and Gill and Perry (1979)), golf (Eggert (1978), Johnson (1972), and Gold (1955)), tennis (Eggert (1978), LaGrand (1970), Wisnieski (1980), Gold (1955), and Knapp (1965)), karate (Kroll et al. (1967)), wrestling (LaGrand (1970), Wardell (1977), Dallman (1973)), soccer (LaGrand (1970)), bowling (Johnson (1972)), field hockey (Johnson (1972)), and track and field (Wardell (1977) and Schliesman (1987)).

Rath (1983) analyzed the differences in leadership role perceptions between the head intercollegiate volleyball coach and the athletes. Nine major dimensions of leadership were measured using the LBDQ. The subjects included 132 athletes and sixteen coaches. Results showed a significant difference in three of the nine

dimensions. The perception of leadership role showed no significant differences between the athletes and coaches with the exception of the dimensions of membership, integration, and recognition.

Schliesman (1987) used the Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS) to survey forty female track and field athletes in order to measure two aspects of leadership: satisfaction with general leadership and satisfaction with specific leader behaviors. The five specific leader behaviors measured were training and instruction, social support, positive feedback, democratic behavior, and autocratic behavior. General satisfaction with leadership was found to be related to actual scores in democratic behavior and actual scores in social support. Satisfaction with specific leader behaviors was related to discrepancy scores in training and instruction, social support, and positive feedback.

Hendry (1969) performed a personality study of highly successful and "ideal" swimming coaches. Forty-eight selected coaches and thirty international caliber junior age swimmers constructed their "ideal" coach's personality profile on a ten-point scale using Cattell's 16 PF questionnaire. The results indicated that the greatest similarities existed between the coaches' subjective self-assessments and the "ideal" coach, as well as between the coaches' and swimmers' estimations of the "ideal" coach.

## The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire

### Descriptions

The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) encompasses two indices: 'Consideration' and 'Initiating Structure.' Consideration has been described by Misumi (1985) as the concern for people, and 'initiating structure' as the concern for production. Cox (1985) described consideration to be "indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth between the coach and the athlete" and initiating structure to be "a leadership style in which patterns of organization, channels of communication, and procedures were well established." (p. 308) In the handbook for the LBDQ, Halpin (1957) described initiating structure as a leader's behavior "in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of his group." (p. 1) Halpin (1957) described consideration as referring to "behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationship between leader and members of the group." (p. 1)

### Development and Uses of the LBDQ

The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed by the Ohio State University's Research Studies Program from numerous field studies conducted in management science. The initial work involved defining and measuring leadership behaviors,

specifically in the area of universal behaviors. The original leadership behavior classifications were identified by Hemphill and Coons in the 1950's. The LBDQ has seen many applications in corporate settings, military settings, and educational situations as well as the athletics area. (Stogdill, 1974)

The LBDQ can be modified to meet the needs of the particular survey conducted as well as the particular needs of the researcher. The use of a questionnaire method of surveying became widespread in the 1950's when researchers liked the fact that it provided a rating scale developed to measure consideration and initiating structure. (Stogdill, 1974) Stogdill reported of its use in military surveys utilizing air crews and their crew chiefs. The military provided a great and fertile field for testing this form of leadership survey.

It was only logical to utilize the LBDQ in military situations since these presented the most cut-and-dried examples of the leader-follower dyad available and the internal validity was well controlled. Still, the question as to how these studies would carry over into the civilian world was to be answered. Thus, following the military trials, the instrument was used in educational research. Surveys of teachers, supervisors, superintendents, and board of education members were conducted and the results correlated well with the military studies.



As the survey continued to be used, it was also continually refined to provide even better results for the researchers. After using the questionnaire in the fields of military and educational research, it was only natural to continue the process and carry it into the athletic area. Danielson et al. (1974) used the LBDQ to survey 160 adolescent hockey players, ages 12-18, to determine the dimensionality of commonly perceived coaching behaviors. The questionnaire took thirty minutes to complete using a 140 question form. This survey resulted in fifty-seven of the most commonly reported coaching behaviors which were later subjected to factor analysis and multidimensional scaling procedures. (Danielson et al., 1974) Von Strache utilized the LBDQ to determine the leadership behavior characteristics of coaches of a losing team and found a perception of uncertainty on the part of the coaches as seen by the athletes. (Frankhauser, 1978) Rath (1983) used the LBDQ in an investigation in which fifty collegiate women's volleyball athletes were to evaluate the head coaches in nine different domains of leadership. Wisnieski (1980) used the LBDQ with four collegiate tennis teams and four collegiate softball teams to determine the members' interpretations of the behaviors of their coaches in an individual and a team sport. Waldenberger (1975) analyzed leader behavior in physical education departments with the LBDQ. The LBDQ has developed a wide

usefulness in these area.

The LBDO was validated by using a group of actors and naive observers. The procedure is described as follows:

In order to test the validity of several subscales of the LBDO, Stogdill (1969), with the assistance of a playwright, wrote a scenario for each of six subscales (consideration, structure, representation, tolerance of freedom, production emphasis and superior orientation). The items in the subscale were used as a basis for writing the scenario for that pattern of behavior. Experienced actors played the roles of supervisor and workers. Each role was played by two different actors, and each actor played two different roles. Motion pictures were made of the role performances. Observers used the LBDO to describe the superior's behavior. No significant differences were found between two different actors playing the same role. Still, the actors playing a given role were described significantly higher than in other roles. Since each role was designed to portray the behaviors represented by the items in its representative subscale, and since the same items were used by observers to describe enactment of the role, it can be concluded that the scales measure what they are propoorted to measure. (Stogdill, 1974, p. 144)

The estimated reliability by the split-half method is .83 for the initiating structure scores and .90 for the consideration scores. (Halpin, 1957, p. 1)

## CHAPTER III

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### Selection of Subjects

A sample of 200 colleges and universities was selected from the 2,000 schools listed in The 1990-1991 Directory of College Athletics (Women's Edition) (Franks, 1987). A random numbers table generated a set of numbers that corresponded to page and line numbers providing the identification of random schools to be surveyed. These schools were then reviewed to determine if they met the two basic criteria: (1) the schools had to have a women's softball program, and (2) they had to be located within the continental United States.

#### Construction of Instrument

With the permission of the Ohio State University (Appendix 3) a modified form of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was constructed and distributed to the schools being surveyed. The questionnaire consisted of fifty items, forty of which were scored. There were also ten questions of a demographic nature used to gather information about the respondents. The modified version of the LBDQ was short and concise enough to be completed in thirty minutes and was constructed in a manner that allowed it to be answered on a Scantron (c) answer sheet which would facilitate computer scoring and analysis.

The athletes' LBDQ questionnaire statements specifically pertained to the coach who was responsible for the respondents' activity. Each statement in the athletes' LBDQ section began with "My coach..." The statements were arranged in both the negative and positive form to eliminate the possibility of predictability of selections on the part of the respondents. Point values from 1 to 5 were assigned to each answer with 1 being the most negative and 5 being the most positive. These scores were separated into their respective dimensions to give initiating structure and consideration scores for the coaches.

#### Administration of the Instrument

A packet was compiled consisting of questionnaires and answer sheets for the coaches and questionnaires and answer sheets for the athletes of each school surveyed, in addition to cover letters explaining the purpose of the survey and giving instructions for its administration. The questionnaires were to be administered to the athletes during a team gathering of sufficient length for the athletes to read and answer the questions. The completed questionnaires were collected and placed in a return envelope that had been provided as part of the survey package. Packets were then processed by the investigator.

### Statistical Procedures

The data was subjected to a t-test to determine if any differences existed between male and female coaches on the dimensions of consideration and initiating structure and a one-way analysis of variance to determine if any difference existed among the four coaching groups identified.

## CHAPTER IV

## ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS

The results of the data analysis are presented in this chapter. Two-hundred and twenty-three scored their coaches on two dimensions of leadership: Consideration and Initiating Structure. Too few questionnaires were completed by coaches to merit analysis of coaching self description. Descriptive statistics are presented to characterize the sample of athletes. The computer program used to analyze the data was the "Statistical Package for Social Sciences", SPSS release 4.0 VAX/VMS, San Diego State University on UCSVAX: V5.4.

Comparison between Male and Female Coaches

The analysis of the data was performed using a t-test to compare for any significant differences between mean scores on the two dimensions of leadership behavior for male and female coaches. The means, standard deviations and t ratios for these scores are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1  
T-TEST FOR SIGNIFICANCE IN COMPARING MALE AND FEMALE  
COACHES OF WOMENS' SOFTBALL

Group	N	Consideration		Initiating Structure		df	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Male Coaches	151	56.166	9.71	57.232	7.92	221	-0.08
Female Coaches	72	56.278	9.56	58.722	8.27		

$p = .05$

With 221 df, a  $t$  of 1.960 is needed for significance at the .05 level. The results of the  $t$ -test showed no significant difference in the leadership dimension scores of male and female coaches.

The descriptive statistics for the consideration and initiating structure scores of the coaches are divided into groups based on the sex of the coach and presented in Table 2.

The results of the analysis of variance performed on the consideration mean scores for the four coaching groups are shown in Table 3.

TABLE 2  
STATISTICS FOR CONSIDERATION AND INITIATING STRUCTURE  
FOR SOFTBALL COACHES BY SEX AND COACHING POSITION

Group	N	Consideration		Initiating Structure	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Male Head Coaches	92	55.707	9.862	58.163	7.479
Female Head Coaches	59	55.932	9.582	59.661	7.982
Male Assistant Coaches	59	56.881	9.507	55.780	8.428
Female Assistant Coaches	13	57.846	9.660	54.462	8.540

These statistics show nearly identical means and standard deviations for male and female head coaches as well as for male and female assistant coaches on the consideration and initiating structure dimensions. In order to determine if any significant differences existed among these means, the data was subjected to a one-way analysis of variance. The results of the one-way analysis of variance performed on the consideration scores for the four coaching groups are presented in Table 3.



TABLE 3  
SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR  
COMPARISON OF MEANS AMONG THE FOUR COACHING  
GROUPS FOR CONSIDERATION

Source of Variation	ss	df	ms	f
Between groups	93.68	3	31.23	0.003
Within groups	2670530.90	219	12194.21	
Total	2670624.58	222		

$p = .05$

The results of the one-way analysis of variance performed on the initiating structure scores for the four coaching groups as determined by sex and coaching position are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4  
SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF ANALYSIS FOR VARIANCE FOR  
COMPARISON OF MEANS AMONG THE FOUR COACHING  
GROUPS FOR INITIATING STRUCTURE

Source of Variation	ss	df	ms	f
Between groups	90.56	3	30.18	0.032
Within groups	202334.10	219	923.90	
Total	202424.66	222		

$p = .05$

With 3 and 219 df, an F of 8.54 is needed for significance at the .05 level. The results of the one-way analysis of variance performed on the mean Consideration and Initiating Structure scores showed no significant difference in these leadership dimensions for any of the four coaching groups identified.

### Discussion of Results

Female intercollegiate softball athletes do not seem to perceive male and female coaches' leadership differently. The results of this study support the results of previous research. Hile (1985) determined that leadership behavior of male and female basketball coaches did not differ significantly when perceived by female athletes. Butterfield and Powell (1981) found that the sex of leaders did not appear to have an effect on how they were rated by their followers. They found that male and female leaders using the same leadership style were rated essentially the same. When Weinberg et al. (1984) investigated the attitudes of male and female athletes toward male and female coaches, they found that "the female athletes did not perceive male and female coaches differently." (1984, p. 452) The results of one study differed from these findings. Parkhouse and Williams (1986) found that male and female athletes rated the male coaches the same and always higher than the female coach. They also found that 89 percent of the male athletes and 71 percent of the female athletes preferred a male coach. A few differences were noted by some investigators.

Studying a dimension similar to consideration, Newcomb (1977) noted that athletes perceived female coaches as easier to approach than male coaches. The present study showed males only slightly lower than

females in the consideration dimension. This finding differs from those of Young (1981) who showed that male coaches, when working with female athletes, scored higher in the consideration domain than female coaches. It has been shown that men and women rate themselves the same. (Williams 1987)

The present study indicated that approximately 27 percent of the female athletes had been coached by a woman. This is greatly lower than the figures produced by George (1988) who found that 84 percent of the female athletes surveyed had been coached by a woman.

While this study presented statistics concerning assistant coaches, a review of the literature yielded no studies in which assistant coaches were viewed separately from head coaches. By breaking down the two sex groups into the separate coaching position groups, additional analyses of differences may be studied. This may be an area for future study.

## CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this research was to determine if any differences in leadership behavior existed between male and female coaches of women's intercollegiate softball. Athletes (N = 223) from fourteen colleges and universities were surveyed using the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire.

The data was collected during the Spring & Summer semesters of 1992. Means and standard deviations were computed. A t-test was performed to determine if any significant differences existed between the mean scores for men and women. In addition, a one-way analysis was performed on the mean Consideration and Initiating Structure scores for the four coaching groups.

Conclusions

Based on the data obtained from this investigation, the following conclusions can be reported:

1. There was no significant difference in leadership behavior of male and female coaches as perceived by female intercollegiate softball athletes.
2. There was no significant difference between the mean scores of the athletes' perceptions of the leadership behavior for head coaches (regardless of sex) and for assistant coaches (regardless of sex).

### Recommendations

Based on the results of this research, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. There are many studies reviewing leadership of coaches but few have examined the possible feasibility of using athlete completed questionnaires in the evaluation and direction of athletes. Could such questionnaires be used in a prophylactic manner to prevent a variety of problems ranging from athletic liability to personality conflicts?
2. Studies such as this need to be performed several times over the course of an athletic season. Pre-season, mid-season, and post-season surveys should be made in order to observe changes in responses by the athletes. This would help determine if factors such as maturity or improved motor skills, play a role in athletes' evaluations of coaches.

APPENDIX 1  
LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

17 March 1992

Dear Coach,

I am an active duty Lieutenant Commander attending Navy Post Graduate education at San Diego State University in the Education Training and Management specialty. A graduation requirement is a research project. I have chosen a descriptive study to determine if there are any differences in the leadership behavior of male and female coaches of women's intercollegiate softball. I am writing to ask for your assistance in this endeavor. I am interested both in how the athletes perceive their respective coaches and how the leadership behavior between male and female coaches may differ. The results of this study should give those currently coaching and those planning a coaching career a better insight into the dynamics of the profession. Similar surveys have been conducted in other sports as well as other professions and have proven to be a valuable resource tool.

I realize time constraints under which you operate as a coach. As a former coach, I understand the difficulty in gathering your athletes together in one place in order to administer a questionnaire. The questionnaire was constructed to be as short and simple as possible in order to increase the ease and speed of administration. I suggest that you may consider administering it either at a team meeting or during a warm up or cool down period when all your athletes are together. It should only take twenty minutes to complete the survey.

I appreciate how valuable your time is, especially this time of year as you prepare for your season. If you could administer this survey to all your female athletes and return it in the enclosed post paid envelope by July 1, 1992, I would appreciate it. Your participation is critical if we are to understand the coaching profession better. Please be assured that complete anonymity is guaranteed.

I thank you in advance for your participation.

Sincerely,

Peggy L. Lau



APPENDIX 2  
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY LEADERSHIP  
BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Developed by staff members of  
The Ohio State Leadership Studies

Name of Leader Being Described \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Group Which He/She Leads \_\_\_\_\_

Your Name \_\_\_\_\_

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

Note: The term "group," as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.

The term "members," refers to all the people in the unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.

DIRECTIONS:

- a. READ each item carefully.
- b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.
- c. DECIDE whether he/she always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.
- d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always  
B = Often  
C = Occasionally  
D = Seldom  
E = Never

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Does personal favors for group members.                             | A | B | C | D | E |
| 2. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group.                         | A | B | C | D | E |
| 3. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 4. Tries out his/her new ideas with the group.                         | A | B | C | D | E |
| 5. Acts as the leader of the group.                                    | A | B | C | D | E |
| 6. Is easy to understand.  | A | B | C | D | E |
| 7. Rules with an iron hand.  | A | B | C | D | E |
| 8. Finds time to listen to group members.                              | A | B | C | D | E |
| 9. Criticizes poor work.   | A | B | C | D | E |
| 10. Gives advance notice of changes.                                   | A | B | C | D | E |
| 11. Speaks in a manner not to be questioned.                           | A | B | C | D | E |
| 12. Keeps to himself/herself.  | A | B | C | D | E |
| 13. Looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.    | A | B | C | D | E |
| 14. Assigns group members to particular tasks.                         | A | B | C | D | E |
| 15. Is the spokesperson of the group.                                  | A | B | C | D | E |
| 16. Schedules the work to be done.                                     | A | B | C | D | E |
| 17. Maintains definite standards of performance.                       | A | B | C | D | E |
| 18. Refuses to explain his/her behavior.                               | A | B | C | D | E |
| 19. Keeps the group informed.  | A | B | C | D | E |
| 20. Acts without consulting the group.                                 | A | B | C | D | E |
| 21. Backs up the members in their actions.                             | A | B | C | D | E |

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22. Emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.                                | A | B | C | D | E |
| 23. Treats all group members as his/her equal.                          | A | B | C | D | E |
| 24. Encourages the use of uniform procedures.                           | A | B | C | D | E |
| 25. Gets what he/she asks for from his/her supervisors.                 | A | B | C | D | E |
| 26. Is willing to make changes.   | A | B | C | D | E |
| 27. Makes sure that his/her part in the organization is understood.     | A | B | C | D | E |
| 28. Is friendly and approachable.                                       | A | B | C | D | E |
| 29. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.      | A | B | C | D | E |
| 30. Fails to take necessary action.                                     | A | B | C | D | E |
| 31. Makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.            | A | B | C | D | E |
| 32. Lets group members know what is expected of them.                   | A | B | C | D | E |
| 33. Speaks as the representative of the group.                          | A | B | C | D | E |
| 34. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation                   | A | B | C | D | E |
| 35. Sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.           | A | B | C | D | E |
| 36. Lets other people take away his/her leadership in the group.        | A | B | C | D | E |
| 37. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 38. Gets group approval in important matters before going ahead.        | A | B | C | D | E |
| 39. Sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.           | A | B | C | D | E |
| 40. Keeps the group working together as a team.                         | A | B | C | D | E |

APPENDIX 3  
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY LBDO  
POLICY STATEMENT

## STATEMENT OF POLICY

### Concerning the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and Related Forms

Permission is granted without formal request to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and other related forms developed at The Ohio State University, subject to the following conditions:

1. Use: The forms may be used in research projects. They may not be used for promotional activities or for producing income on behalf of individuals or organizations other than The Ohio State University.
2. Adaptation and Revision: The directions and the form of the items may be adapted to specific situations when such steps are considered desirable.
3. Duplication: Sufficient copies for a specific research project may be duplicated.
4. Inclusion in dissertations: Copies of the questionnaire may be included in theses and dissertations. Permission is granted for the duplication of such dissertations when filed with the University Microfilms Service at Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 U.S.A.
5. Copyright: In granting permission to modify or duplicate the questionnaire, we do not surrender our copyright. Duplicated questionnaires and all adaptations should contain the notation "Copyright, 19\_\_, by The Ohio State University."
6. Inquiries: Communications should be addressed to:

Administrative Science Research  
The Ohio State University  
1775 College Road  
Columbus OH 43210

APPENDIX 4  
THE LBDQ USER'S MANUAL

MANUAL  
for the  
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Andrew W. Halpin

Bureau of Business Research  
College of Commerce and Administration  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus, Ohio

1957



## MANUAL FOR LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

The leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) provides a technique whereby group members may describe the leader behavior of designated leaders in formal organizations. The LBDQ contains items, each of which describes a specific way in which a leader may behave. The respondent indicates the frequency with which he perceives the leader to engage in each type of behavior by marking one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom, never. These responses are obtained from the members of the leader's immediate work-group, and are scored on two dimensions of leader behavior. For each dimension, the scores from the several group members are then averaged to yield an index of the leaders behavior. For each dimension, the scores from the several group members are then averaged to yield an index of the leader's behavior in respect to that dimension.

The LBDQ was developed by the staff of the Personnel Research Board, The Ohio State University, as one project of the Ohio State Leadership Studies, directed by Dr. Carroll L. Shartle. Hemphill and Coons (14) constructed the original form of the questionnaire; and Halpin and Winer (11) in reporting the development of an Air Force adaptation of the instrument, identified Initiating Structure and Consideration as two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior. These dimensions were identified on the basis of a factor analysis of the responses of 300 B-29 crew members who described the leader behavior of their 52 aircraft commanders. Initiating Structure and Consideration accounted for approximately 34 to 50 percent respectively of the common variance. In a subsequent study based upon a sample of 249 aircraft commanders, the correlation between the scores on the two dimensions was found to be .38.

Initiating Structure refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of his group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and ways of getting the job done. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationship between the leader and members of the group.

Only 30 of the 40 items are scored; 15 for each of the two dimensions. The 10 unscored items have been retained in the questionnaire in order to keep the conditions of administration comparable to those used in standardizing the questionnaire. The scored items for each of the two dimension keys are listed on Pages 4 and 6.

The score for each dimension is the sum of the scores assigned to responses marked on each of the 15 items in the dimension. The possible range of scores on each dimension is 0 to 60.

The estimated reliability by the split-half method is .83 for the Initiative Structure scores, and .92 for the Consideration scores, when corrected for attenuation.

In several studies (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10) where the agreement among respondents in describing their respective leaders has been checked by a "between-vs. within-group" analysis of variance, the F ratios all have been found significant at the .01 level. Followers tend to agree in describing the same leader, and the descriptions of different leaders differ significantly.

The LBDQ has been used for research purposes in industrial, military, and educational settings. Fleishman (2, 3, 4) and Fleisman, Harris and Burt (5) have used the LBDQ for use in their studies of factory foremen and have found the two leader behavior dimensions useful in evaluating the results of a supervisory training program. Halpin (7) has reported the relationship between the aircraft commander's behavior on these dimensions and evaluations of his performance made both by his superiors and his crew members; and has presented evidence (6) which indicates that the most "effective" commanders are those who score high on the both dimensions of leader behavior. Similarly, Hemphill (12) in a study of 22 departments in a liberal arts college, found that the departments with the best campus "reputation" for being well administered were those whose leaders were described as above the average on both dimensions of leader behavior. Halpin has reported the LBDQ descriptions of a sample of 50 school superintendents (10), and elsewhere has compared the leader behavior of aircraft commanders and school administrators (8). A list of pertinent studies in which the LBDQ has been used is given on the last page of this manual. These studies are summarized in a monograph edited by Stogdill and Coons (14).

#### Administration of the LBDQ

The questionnaire may be given wither individually or to small groups. The purpose, of course, should be explained. It is best not to have the leader physically present while the group members are describing his behavior. It also is preferable to be able to guarantee the protection of the anonymity of each respondent. Inasmuch as each index score used to describe the leader's behavior is derived by averaging the scores by which his group members describe him it is not necessary to identify each respondent by name. The only name required on the questionnaire blank is the name of leader who is being described.

How many respondents are needed to provide a satisfactory index score for the leader's behavior? Experience suggests that a minimum of four respondents per leader is desirable, and that additional respondents beyond ten do not increase significantly the stability of the index scores. Six or seven respondents per

leader would be a good standard. Obviously, much depends upon the particular leader and group in which one may be interested. If the group is large, then it is possible to select about seven respondents from the larger group by use of a table of random numbers. (The use of this method, with a built-in provision to counteract the effect of absences, as described in Reference No. 10).

In administering the LBDQ, no mention should be made of the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions. The respondents should merely be told that they are to describe the approximate frequency with which the leader engages in each of the behaviors specified in the questionnaire items. If questions arise, simply instruct the respondents to "make the best estimate possible." Urge, however, that every item be answered.

### Interpretation of Scores

When each LBDQ answer sheet has been scored on each of the two dimensions, and scores secured from the several respondents have been averaged separately by dimension, then the two average scores may be designated as the leader's Initiating Structure and Consideration index scores. Each index score should be rounded to the nearest whole number.

How may these Initiating Structure and Consideration scores be interpreted? Preferably, the members of a given sample of leaders should be evaluated in respect to their relative position on each dimension, as compared with other members of that same sample. At present we do not have LBDQ data available on many different types of leaders. What data we have should therefore not be construed as norms, in the strict sense of the term. But in order to provide some basis for interpreting LBDQ scores, we may refer to data secured from three independent samples of leaders.

Sample I consisted of 251 B-29 aircraft commanders (AC's) each of whom was described by an average of 8 crew members. In no instance were there less and 4 or more than 10 respondents descriptions.

Sample II was composed of 144 RB-47 aircraft commanders (AC's), each of whom was described by his 2 fellow crew men.

Sample III comprises 64 educational administrators (EA's) of Ohio public schools. The majority of this sample are school superintendents, each of whom was described by 7 staff members.

The means, standard deviations, and quartile points, for these three samples are given in Table 1 for Initiating Structure, and in Table 2, for Consideration. Because the three samples are not directly comparable, no attempt has been made to consolidate the data across samples. Although these data are not sufficient to serve as norms, they may be used as a rough guide for interpreting LBDQ scores.

Items in the Consideration Scale

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Item</u>
1.	He does personal favors for group members.
3.	He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.
6.	He is easy to understand.
8.	He finds time to listen to group members.
12.	He keeps to himself.*
13.	He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.
18.	He refuses to explain his actions.*
20.	He acts without consulting the group.*
21.	He backs up the members in their actions.
23.	He treats all group members as his equals.
26.	He is willing to make changes.
28.	He is friendly and approachable.
31.	He makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.
34.	He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.
38.	He gets group approval on important matters before going ahead.

Items 5, 10, 15, 19, 25, 30, 33, 36, 37 and 40 are not scored on either dimension.

\*These items are scored in reverse.

SCORING KEY FOR CONSIDERATION

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Always</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Never</u>
1	4	3	2	1	0
3	4	3	2	1	0
6	4	3	2	1	0
8	4	3	2	1	0
12	0	1	2	3	4
13	4	3	2	1	0
18	0	1	2	3	4
20	0	1	2	3	4
21	4	3	2	1	0
23	4	3	2	1	0
26	4	3	2	1	0
28	4	3	2	1	0
31	4	3	2	1	0
34	4	3	2	1	0
38	4	3	2	1	0

Items in the Initiating Structure Scale

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Item</u>
2.	He makes his attitudes clear to the group.
4.	He tries out his new ideas with the group.
7.	He rules with an iron hand.
9.	He criticizes poor work.
11.	He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.
14.	He assigns group members to particular tasks.
16.	He schedules the work to be done.
17.	He maintains definite standards of performance.
22.	He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.
24.	He encourages the use of uniform procedures.
27.	He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by all group members.
29.	He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.
32.	He lets group members know what is expected of them.
35.	He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.
39.	He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.

SCORING KEY FOR INITIATING STRUCTURE

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Always</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Never</u>
2	4	3	2	1	0
4	4	3	2	1	0
7	4	3	2	1	0
9	4	3	2	1	0
11	4	3	2	1	0
14	4	3	2	1	0
16	4	3	2	1	0
17	4	3	2	1	0
22	4	3	2	1	0
24	4	3	2	1	0
27	4	3	2	1	0
29	4	3	2	1	0
32	4	3	2	1	0
35	4	3	2	1	0
39	4	3	2	1	0

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations,  $Q_3$ ,  $Q_2$ , and  $Q_1$  for Initiating Structure  
Index Scores for Three Samples of Leaders

	Sample I (251 B-29 & B-50 AC's)	Sample II (144 RB-47 AC's)	Sample III (64 Educational Administrators)
$Q_3$	45*	44	41
$Q_2$	42	41	39
$Q_1$	39	36	35
Mean	41.6	40.3	37.9
$\sigma$	4.5	6.1	4.4

\*Quartile points rounded to nearest integer

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations,  $Q_3$ ,  $Q_2$ , and  $Q_1$  for Consideration Index  
Scores for Three Samples of Leaders

	Sample I (251 B-29 & B-50 AC's)	Sample II (144 RB-47 AC's)	Sample III (64 Educational Administrators)
$Q_3$	46*	51	49
$Q_2$	42	48	46
$Q_1$	37	40	42
Mean	41.4	44.8	44.7
$\sigma$	7.3	8.7	6.0

\*Quartile points rounded to nearest integer



## REFERENCES

1. Christner, Charlotte A. & Hemphill, J. K. Leader behavior of B-29 commanders in crew members' attitudes toward the crew. Sociometry, 1955, 18, 82-87
2. Fleishman, E. A. "Leadership climate" and supervisory behavior: A study of the leadership role of the foreman in an industrial situation. Columbus, Ohio
3. Fleishman, E. A. The measurement of leadership attitudes in industry, J. appl. Psychol., 1953, 37, 153-158
4. Fleishman, E. A. The description of supervisory behavior. J. appl. Psychol. 1953, 37, 1-6
5. Fleishman, E. A., Harris, E. F. & Burt, H. E. Leadership and Supervision in Industry. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research Monograph No. 33, 1956.
6. Halpin, A. W. Studies in aircrew composition. III. The combat leader behavior of B-29 aircraft commanders. Bolling Air Force Base, Washington D.C. Human Factors Operations Research Laboratory, Sept 1953 (HFORL Memo No. TN-54-7)
7. Halpin, A. W. The leadership behavior and combat performance of airplane commanders. J. abnorm. & Soc. Psychol., 1954, 49, 19-22.
8. Halpin, A. W. The leader behavior and leadership ideology of educational administrators and aircraft commanders. Harvard Educ. Rev., 1955.
9. Halpin, A. W. The leadership ideology of aircraft commanders. J. appl. Psychol., 1955, 39, 82-84.
10. Halpin, A. W. The leadership behavior of school superintendents: A study of 50 Ohio superintendents. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, School Community Development Study Monograph (in press).
11. Halpin, A. W. & Winer, B. J. The leadership behavior of the airplane commander. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1952. (Technical Report III prepared for Human Resources Laboratory, Dept. of the Air Force, under Contracts AF 33(038) - 10105.

12. Hemphill, J. K. Patterns of leadership behavior associated with administrative reputation of the department of a college. J. Educ. Psychol., (in press)
13. Hush, C. H., Jr. Group dimensions of aircrews. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1953. ((Out of Print)).
14. Stogdill, Ralph M. & Coons, Alvin E., Editors. Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research Monograph No. 88, 1957.

APPENDIX 5  
ATHLETE'S QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE MARK ALL ANSWERS ON SCANTRON COMPUTER ANSWER SHEET.  
PLEASE USE PENCIL TO MARK ALL ANSWERS.

PLEASE PROVIDE THE BEST ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION.

1. AGE: 16 - 18 \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
19 - 21 \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
22 - 24 \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
25 - 27 \_\_\_\_\_ (D)  
over 28 \_\_\_\_\_ (E)
2. PRESENT CLASS STATUS: FRESHMAN \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
SOPHOMORE \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
JUNIOR \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
SENIOR \_\_\_\_\_ (D)
3. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN COMPETING IN SOFTBALL?  
0 - 2 \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
3 - 5 \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
6 - 8 \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
9 or more \_\_\_\_\_ (D)
4. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN COMPETING AT THIS COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY?  
0 - 1 \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
2 \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
3 \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
4 \_\_\_\_\_ (D)  
5 or more \_\_\_\_\_ (E)
5. HOW MANY SOFTBALL COACHES HAVE YOU HAD?  
Including Jr. High, H. S., J. C., etc.  
0 - 1 \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
2 - 3 \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
4 - 5 \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
6 - 7 \_\_\_\_\_ (D)  
8 or more \_\_\_\_\_ (E)
6. OF THE NUMBER LISTED IN QUESTION 5, HOW MANY WERE MEN?  
0 - 1 \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
2 - 3 \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
4 - 5 \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
6 - 7 \_\_\_\_\_ (D)  
8 or more \_\_\_\_\_ (E)
7. OF THE NUMBER LISTED IN QUESTION 5, HOW MANY WERE WOMEN?  
0 - 1 \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
2 - 3 \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
4 - 5 \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
6 - 7 \_\_\_\_\_ (D)  
8 or more \_\_\_\_\_ (E)

8. WHAT IS YOUR SPECIALTY: (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

HITTING \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
INFIELD \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
OUTFIELD \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
PITCHING \_\_\_\_\_ (D)  
MULTIEVENTS \_\_\_\_\_ (E)

9. WHICH COACH PRESENTLY WORKS WITH YOU THE MOST IN PREPARING YOU TO COMPETE IN YOUR PRESENT SPECIALTY?

MALE HEAD COACH ..... (A)  
FEMALE HEAD COACH ... (B)  
MALE ASSISTANT COACH \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
FEMALE ASSISTANT COACH \_\_\_\_\_ (D)

IN THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONNAIRE, PLEASE CHOOSE YOUR ANSWERS WITH YOUR MAIN SPECIALTY COACH IN MIND.

PLEASE MARK ALL YOUR ANSWERS IN THE CORRESPONDING COLUMNS ON THIS SHEET.  
DO NOT PUT NAME ON QUESTIONNAIRE.  
TAKES ABOUT TWENTY MINUTES TO COMPLETE QUESTIONNAIRE.

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - ATHLETE'S VERSION

- A. Answer each statement with your MAIN SPECIALTY COACH in mind.
- B. READ EACH STATEMENT CAREFULLY.
- C. THINK about how frequently your MAIN SPECIALTY COACH engages in the behavior described by the statement.
- D. DECIDE whether your Coach ALWAYS, OFTEN, OCCASIONALLY, SELDOM or NEVER acts as described in the statement.
- E. IN COLUMNS FOLLOWING STATEMENTS, CIRCLE one of the five letters following the statement to show the answer you have selected.

SELECTIONS ARE: (A) = ALWAYS ACTS THIS WAY  
(B) = OFTEN ACTS THIS WAY  
(C) = OCCASSIONALLY ACTS THIS WAY  
(D) = SELDOM ACTS THIS WAY  
(E) = NEVER ACTS THIS WAY

MY MAIN SPECIALTY COACH:

CIRCLE CORRESPONDING  
LETTER TO MARK ANSWER

- 10. Does personal favors for team members..... A B C D E
- 11. Makes attitude clear to the team..... A B C D E
- 12. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the team..... A B C D E
- 13. Tries out new ideas with the team..... A B C D E
- 14. Acts as the real leader of the team..... A B C D E
- 15. Is easy to understand..... A B C D E
- 16. Is strict..... A B C D E
- 17. Finds time to listen to team members..... A B C D E
- 18. Criticizes poor work..... A B C D E
- 19. Gives advance notice of changes..... A B C D E
- 20. Speaks in a manner not to be questioned..... A B C D E

21. Keeps to himself/herself..... A B C D E
22. Looks out for the personal welfare of  
individual team members..... A B C D E
23. Assigns team members to particular tasks..... A B C D E
24. Is the spokesperson for the team..... A B C D E
25. Schedules work to be done..... A B C D E
26. Maintains definite standards of performance.... A B C D E
27. Does not explain own actions..... A B C D E
28. Keeps the team informed..... A B C D E
29. Acts without consulting the team..... A B C D E
30. Backs up the members in their actions..... A B C D E
31. Emphasizes the meeting of deadlines..... A B C D E
32. Treats all team members the same..... A B C D E
33. Encourages the use of uniform procedures..... A B C D E
34. Gets everything asked for from superiors..... A B C D E
35. Is willing to make changes..... A B C D E
36. Makes sure his/her own part in the organization  
is understood by team members..... A B C D E
37. Is friendly and approachable ..... A B C D E
38. Asks that team members follow standard rules  
and regulations..... A B C D E
39. Does not take necessary action..... A B C D E
40. Makes team members feel at ease when talking  
with them..... A B C D E
41. Lets team members know what is expected  
of them..... A B C D E
42. Speaks of the representative of the team..... A B C D E
43. Puts suggestions made by the team into  
operation..... A B C D E
44. Sees to it that team members are working  
up to capacity..... A B C D E
45. Lets other people lead the team in his/her  
place..... A B C D E
46. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare  
of the team members..... A B C D E
47. Gets team approval in important matters  
before going ahead..... A B C D E
48. Sees to it that the work of team members  
is coordinated..... A B C D E
49. Keeps the team working together as a team..... A B C D E

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

Copyright 1988, by The Ohio State University

APPENDIX 6  
COACHES' QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE ANSWER THIS SIDE FIRST.

PLEASE MARK ALL ANSWERS ON THE SCANTRON COMPUTERIZED ANSWER SHEET.

PLEASE MARK ALL ANSWERS IN PENCIL.

PLEASE PROVIDE THE BEST ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LBDQ.

1. AGE  
21 - 24 \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
25 - 28 \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
over 28 \_\_\_\_\_ (C)
2. PRESENT COACHING STATUS: HEAD COACH (Female) \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
HEAD COACH (Male) \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
ASSISTANT COACH (Female) \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
ASSISTANT COACH (Male) \_\_\_\_\_ (D)
3. TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS YOU HAVE BEEN COACHING SOFTBALL:  
0 - 2 \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
3 - 5 \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
6 - 8 \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
9 or more \_\_\_\_\_ (D)
4. TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS YOU HAVE BEEN COACHING AT THIS COLLEGE/  
UNIVERSITY:  
0 - 2 \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
3 - 5 \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
6 - 8 \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
9 or more \_\_\_\_\_ (D)
5. TOTAL NUMBER OF SOFTBALL COACHES WITH WHOM YOU HAVE COACHED:  
0 - 1 \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
2 - 3 \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
4 - 5 \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
6 - 7 \_\_\_\_\_ (D)  
8 or more \_\_\_\_\_ (E)
6. OF THE NUMBER LISTED IN QUESTION 5, HOW MANY WERE MEN?  
0 - 1 \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
2 - 3 \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
4 - 5 \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
6 - 7 \_\_\_\_\_ (D)  
8 or more \_\_\_\_\_ (E)
7. OF THE NUMBER LISTED IN QUESTION 5, HOW MANY WERE WOMEN?  
0 - 1 \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
2 - 3 \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
4 - 5 \_\_\_\_\_ (C)  
6 - 7 \_\_\_\_\_ (D)  
8 or more \_\_\_\_\_ (E)



8. WHAT IS YOUR COACHING SPECIALTY: (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

HITTING	_____	(A)
INFIELD	_____	(B)
OUTFIELD	_____	(C)
PITCHING	_____	(D)
MULTIEVENTS	_____	(E)

9. DO YOU WORK WITH:

WOMEN'S TEAM ONLY?	_____	(A)
BOTH MEN'S AND WOMEN'S TEAMS?	_____	(B)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

Copyright 1988, by The Ohio State University

PLEASE MARK ANSWERS ON SCANTRON IN PENCIL.  
DO NOT PUT NAME ON QUESTIONNAIRE OR SCANTRON.  
TAKES ABOUT TWENTY MINUTES TO COMPLETE QUESTIONNAIRE.

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - COACHING STAFF VERSION

- A. Answer each statement with yourself in mind.
- B. READ EACH STATEMENT CAREFULLY.
- C. THINK about his frequently you engage in the behavior described by the statement.
- D. DECIDE whether you ALWAYS, OFTEN, OCCASIONALLY, SELDOM, or NEVER act as described by the statement.
- E. ON SCANTRON, FILL IN THE BOX for one of the five letters following the statement to show the answer you have selected.

SELECTIONS ARE: (A) = ALWAYS ACTS THIS WAY  
(B) = OFTEN ACTS THIS WAY  
(C) = OCCASIONALLY ACTS THIS WAY  
(D) = SELDOM ACT THIS WAY  
(E) = NEVER ACT THIS WAY

AS A COACH I:

MARK CORRESPONDING  
BOX ON SCANTRON SHEET

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. Do personal favors for team members.....                                 | A | B | C | D | E |
| 11. Clarify my attitude to the team.....                                     | A | B | C | D | E |
| 12. Do little things to make it pleasant to be a<br>member of the team ..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 13. Try out new ideas with the team.....                                     | A | B | C | D | E |
| 14. Act as the real leader of the team.....                                  | A | B | C | D | E |
| 15. Am easy to understand.....   | A | B | C | D | E |
| 16. Am strict.....   | A | B | C | D | E |
| 17. Find time to listen to team members.....                                 | A | B | C | D | E |
| 18. Criticize poor work.....   | A | B | C | D | E |
| 19. Give advance notice of changes.....                                      | A | B | C | D | E |
| 20. Speak in a manner not to be questioned.....                              | A | B | C | D | E |
| 21. Keep to myself.....  | A | B | C | D | E |
| 22. Look out for the personal welfare of<br>individual team members.....     | A | B | C | D | E |
| 23. Assign team members to particular tasks.....                             | A | B | C | D | E |
| 24. Am the spokesperson for the team.....                                    | A | B | C | D | E |
| 25. Schedule work to be done.....  | A | B | C | D | E |
| 26. Maintain definite standards of performance.....                          | A | B | C | D | E |
| 27. Do not explain my actions.....   | A | B | C | D | E |
| 28. Keep the team informed.....  | A | B | C | D | E |
| 29. Act without consulting the team.....                                     | A | B | C | D | E |
| 30. Back up the members in their actions.....                                | A | B | C | D | E |
| 31. Emphasize the meeting of deadlines.....                                  | A | B | C | D | E |
| 32. Treat all the team members the same.....                                 | A | B | C | D | E |
| 33. Encourage the use of uniform procedures.....                             | A | B | C | D | E |

34. Get everything asked for from superiors..... A B C D E  
35. Am willing to make changes..... A B C D E  
36. Make sure my own part in the organization  
is understood by team members..... A B C D E  
37. Am friendly and approachable..... A B C D E  
38. Ask the team members follow standard rules  
and regulations..... A B C D E  
39. Do not take necessary action..... A B C D E  
40. Make team members feel at ease when  
talking with them..... A B C D E  
41. Let team members know what is expected  
of them..... A B C D E  
42. Speak as the representative of the team..... A B C D E  
43. Put suggestions made by the team into  
practice..... A B C D E  
44. See to it that team members are working  
up to capacity..... A B C D E  
45. Allow others to lead the team in my place..... A B C D E  
46. Get my superiors to act for the welfare  
of the team members..... A B C D E  
47. Get team approval in important matters  
before going ahead..... A B C D E  
48. See to it that the work of team members  
is coordinated..... A B C D E  
49. Keep the team working together as a team..... A B C D E

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

Copyright 1988, by The Ohio State University

APPENDIX 7  
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA ON PARTICIPATING ATHLETES

FREQUENCY TABLES FOR ATHLETES COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRE  
(N = 223)

VARIABLE	VALUE	PERCENT
----------	-------	---------

AGE

16-18	27.8
19-21	59.2
22-24	9.9
25-27	2.7
OVER 28	0.4

CLASS

FRESHMAN	39.0
SOPHOMORE	26.9
JUNIOR	15.2
SENIOR	18.8

TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS COMPETING IN SOFTBALL

0-2	14.8
3-5	22.4
6-8	40.4
9 OR MORE	22.4

NUMBER OF YEARS COMPETING AT THIS COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY

0-1	52.0
2	24.7
3	10.3
4	13.0

TOTAL NUMBER OF SOFTBALL COACHES IN ALL YEARS OF SOFTBALL

0-1	7.6
2-3	39.5
4-5	34.5
6-7	11.7
8 OR MORE	6.7

NUMBER OF THESE COACHES THAT WERE MEN

0-1	19.7
2-3	52.0
4-5	22.0
6-7	3.6
8 OR MORE	2.2

NUMBER OF THESE COACHES THAT WERE WOMEN

0-1	72.2
2-3	20.6
4-5	6.3
6-7	0.4
8 OR MORE	0.0

PRIMARY POSITION

HITTING	30.5
INFIELD	9.0
OUTFIELD	52.5
PITCHING	5.8
MULTIEVENTS	2.2

WHICH COACH IS YOUR PRIMARY COACH

HEAD COACH	67.7
ASSISTANT COACH	32.3

APPENDIX 8  
QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES BY SEX

Percent values for each question by sex

Values: 1=Never; 2=Seldom; 3=Occasionally; 4=Often;  
5=Always

VALUE	MALE COACHES	FEMALE COACHES
-------	-----------------	-------------------

DOES PERSONAL FAVORS FOR THE TEAM

1	7.9	9.7
2	14.6	38.9
3	27.8	25.0
4	32.5	15.3
5	16.6	11.1

MAKES ATTITUDE CLEAR TO TEAM

1	1.3	0.0
2	4.0	4.2
3	15.9	9.7
4	33.8	45.8
5	45.0	38.9

DOES LITTLE THINGS TO MAKE PLEASANT TO BE A MEMBER OF THE TEAM

1	2.6	5.6
2	12.6	4.2
3	29.8	22.2
4	24.5	37.5
5	30.5	29.2

TRIES OUT NEW IDEAS ON THE TEAM

1	1.3	0.0
2	4.6	4.2
3	25.8	36.1
4	33.8	37.5
5	33.1	22.2

ACTS AS THE REAL LEADER OF THE TEAM

1	1.3	2.8
2	7.9	5.6
3	15.9	12.5
4	36.4	16.7
5	37.7	62.5

IS EASY TO UNDERSTAND

1	2.0	0.0
2	11.9	1.4
3	18.5	13.9
4	33.8	40.3
5	33.8	44.4



VALUE	MALE COACHES	FEMALE COACHES
-------	-----------------	-------------------

IS STRICT

1	4.6	4.2
2	15.2	9.7
3	38.4	34.7
4	25.8	38.9
5	15.9	12.5

FINDS TIME TO LISTEN TO TEAM MEMBERS

1	0.7	1.4
2	7.9	1.4
3	17.2	19.4
4	29.8	33.3
5	44.4	43.1

CRITICIZES POOR WORK

1	9.3	8.3
2	19.9	12.5
3	27.8	47.2
4	27.8	19.4
5	15.2	11.1

GIVES ADVANCE NOTICE OF CHANGES

1	5.3	1.4
2	13.2	13.9
3	24.5	26.4
4	36.4	27.8
5	19.2	29.2

SPEAKS IN A MANNER NOT TO BE QUESTIONED

1	7.9	4.2
2	17.2	12.5
3	27.8	22.2
4	29.8	43.1
5	15.2	15.3

KEEPS TO HIMSELF/HERSELF

1	4.6	2.8
2	8.6	6.9
3	20.5	22.2
4	40.4	38.9
5	23.2	26.4

VALUE	MALE COACHES	FEMALE COACHES
-------	-----------------	-------------------

LOOKS OUT FOR THE PERSONAL WELFARE OF INDIVIDUAL TEAM MEMBERS

1	0.7	1.4
2	4.6	0.0
3	17.2	20.8
4	32.5	27.8
5	44.4	45.8

ASSIGNS TEAM MEMBERS TO PARTICULAR TASKS

1	3.3	1.4
2	9.9	6.9
3	27.2	40.3
4	39.1	29.2
5	19.9	20.8

IS THE SPOKESPERSON FOR THE TEAM

1	1.3	0.0
2	11.9	1.4
3	20.5	15.3
4	29.8	22.2
5	35.1	56.9

SCHEDULES WORK TO BE DONE

1	1.3	1.4
2	2.0	1.4
3	5.3	4.2
4	34.4	34.7
5	55.6	56.9

MAINTAINS DEFINITE STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE

1	2.0	0.0
2	4.0	2.8
3	17.2	19.4
4	37.7	38.9
5	37.7	38.9

DOES NOT EXPLAIN OWN ACTS

1	4.6	8.3
2	13.9	8.3
3	21.9	26.4
4	40.4	34.7
5	17.2	22.2

VALUE	MALE COACHES	FEMALE COACHES
-------	-----------------	-------------------

KEEPS THE TEAM INFORMED

1	1.3	2.8
2	6.0	4.2
3	11.9	12.5
4	41.7	48.6
5	39.1	31.9

ACTS WITHOUT CONSULTING THE TEAM

1	2.6	4.2
2	13.9	15.3
3	22.5	22.2
4	37.7	41.7
5	21.9	13.9

BACKS UP MEMBERS IN THEIR ACTIONS

1	0.7	1.4
2	5.3	2.8
3	33.8	26.4
4	35.1	47.2
5	23.2	19.4

EMPHASIZES THE MEETING OF SCHEDULES

1	2.0	1.4
2	6.6	4.2
3	27.8	16.7
4	33.8	31.9
5	27.2	44.4

TREATS ALL TEAM MEMBERS TO SAME

1	7.3	2.8
2	15.9	8.3
3	27.8	18.1
4	21.9	40.3
5	26.5	27.8

ENCOURAGES THE USE OF UNIFORM PRACTICES

1	4.6	1.4
2	4.6	2.8
3	23.8	23.6
4	40.4	27.8
5	23.8	41.7

VALUE	MALE COACHES	FEMALE COACHES
-------	-----------------	-------------------

GETS EVERYTHING ASKED FOR FROM SUPERIORS

1	7.3	4.2
2	14.6	43.1
3	33.1	23.6
4	27.2	20.8
5	11.3	4.2

IS WILLING TO MAKE CHANGES

1	2.0	0.0
2	4.0	4.2
3	23.2	19.4
4	36.4	56.9
5	34.4	19.4

MAKES SURE HIS/HER OWN PART IN THE ORGANIZATION IS UNDERSTOOD BY TEAM MEMBERS

1	0.7	1.4
2	4.0	1.4
3	15.9	6.9
4	35.8	43.1
5	43.0	47.2

IF FRIENDLY AND APPROACHABLE

1	0.7	1.4
2	5.3	1.4
3	10.6	16.7
4	29.8	25.0
5	53.6	55.6

ASKS THAT TEAM MEMBERS FOLLOW STANDARD RULES AND REGULATIONS

1	1.3	0.0
2	2.0	4.2
3	9.3	12.5
4	37.7	33.3
5	48.3	50.0

DOES NOT TAKE NECESSARY ACTION

1	27.2	43.1
2	30.5	37.5
3	21.9	8.3
4	10.6	4.2
5	4.6	5.6

VALUE	MALE COACHES	FEMALE COACHES
-------	-----------------	-------------------

MAKES TEAM MEMBERS FEEL AT EASE WHEN TALKING TO THEM

1	1.3	1.4
2	7.3	4.2
3	19.9	16.7
4	26.5	16.7
5	43.7	59.7

LETS TEAM MEMBERS KNOW WHAT IS EXPECTED OF THEM

1	1.3	0.0
2	2.6	0.0
3	11.3	9.7
4	33.8	31.9
5	49.7	56.9

SPEAKS AS THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TEAM

1	2.0	0.0
2	6.0	1.4
3	17.9	9.7
4	29.1	33.3
5	41.1	54.2

PUTS SUGGESTIONS MADE BY THE TEAM INTO OPERATION

1	0.7	2.8
2	6.6	5.6
3	23.2	25.0
4	47.0	37.5
5	21.9	22.2

SEES TO IT THAT THE TEAM MEMBERS ARE WORKING UP TO CAPACITY

1	1.3	0.0
2	2.0	2.8
3	18.5	8.3
4	37.7	45.8
5	35.1	37.5

LET'S OTHER PEOPLE LEAD THE TEAM IN HIS/HER PLACE

1	4.6	8.3
2	19.2	11.1
3	30.5	29.2
4	21.9	37.5
5	17.9	9.7

VALUE	MALE COACHES	FEMALE COACHES
-------	-----------------	-------------------

GETS HIS/HER SUPERIORS TO ACT FOR THE WELFARE OF THE TEAM MEMBERS

1	1.3	5.6
2	10.6	9.7
3	21.9	29.2
4	31.8	25.0
5	21.2	18.1

GETS TEAM APPROVAL IN IMPORTANT MATTERS BEFORE GOING AHEAD

1	0.0	2.8
2	7.9	12.5
3	25.2	12.5
4	33.1	41.7
5	19.9	18.1

SEES TO IT THAT THE WORK OF TEAM MEMBERS IS COORDINATED

1	1.3	2.8
2	2.6	2.8
3	13.9	8.3
4	42.4	51.4
5	27.8	23.6

KEEPS THE TEAM WORKING TOGETHER AS A TEAM

1	1.3	0.0
2	3.3	1.4
3	12.6	5.6
4	35.1	31.9
5	31.8	44.4

APPENDIX 9  
QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES BY COACHING POSITION

Percent scores for each question for Head Coaches versus Assistant Coaches

Values: 1=Never; 2=Seldom; 3=Occasionally; 4=Often; 5=Always

VALUE	HEAD COACHES	ASSISTANT COACHES
-------	-----------------	----------------------

DOES PERSONAL FAVORS FOR TEAM MEMBERS

1	6.6	12.5
2	22.5	22.5
3	31.1	18.1
4	23.8	33.3
5	15.2	13.9

MAKES ATTITUDE CLEAR THE THE TEAM

1	0.0	2.8
2	2.6	6.9
3	13.9	13.9
4	37.1	38.9
5	45.7	37.5

DOES LITTLE THINGS TO MAKE IT PLEASANT TO BE A MEMBER OF THE TEAM

1	4.0	2.8
2	10.6	8.3
3	29.1	23.6
4	25.8	34.7
5	29.8	30.6

TRIES OUT NEW IDEAS WITH THE TEAM

1	0.7	1.4
2	3.3	6.9
3	12.6	34.7
4	38.4	27.8
5	29.8	29.2

ACTS AS THE REAL LEADER OF THE TEAM

1	1.3	2.8
2	4.0	13.9
3	12.6	19.4
4	29.8	30.6
5	51.7	33.3



VALUE	HEAD COACHES	ASSISTANT COACHES
-------	-----------------	----------------------

IS EASY TO UNDERSTAND

1	1.3	1.4
2	9.3	6.9
3	17.2	16.7
4	39.1	29.2
5	33.1	45.8

IS STRICT

1	2.6	0.0
2	9.3	22.2
3	38.4	34.7
4	35.1	19.4
5	14.6	15.3

FINDS TIME TO LISTEN TO TEAM MEMBERS

1	1.3	0.0
2	6.6	4.2
3	19.2	15.3
4	32.5	27.8
5	39.7	52.8

CRITICIZES POOR WORK

1	7.9	11.1
2	17.9	16.7
3	37.1	27.8
4	23.8	27.8
5	12.6	16.7

GIVES ADVANCE NOTICE OF CHANGE

1	4.0	4.2
2	14.6	11.1
3	25.8	23.6
4	34.4	31.9
5	19.9	27.8

SPEAKS IN A MANNER NOT TO BE QUESTIONED

1	4.6	11.1
2	14.6	18.1
3	27.2	23.6
4	37.1	27.8
5	15.2	15.3

\*

VALUE	HEAD COACHES	ASSISTANT COACHES
-------	-----------------	----------------------

KEEPS TO HIMSELF/HERSELF

1	4.0	4.2
2	7.3	9.7
3	23.2	16.7
4	43.0	33.3
5	20.5	31.9

LOOKS OUT FOR THE PERSONAL WELFARE OF INDIVIDUAL TEAM MEMBERS

1	0.7	1.4
2	2.6	4.2
3	19.2	16.7
4	32.5	27.8
5	42.4	50.0

ASSIGNS TEAM MEMBERS TO PARTICULAR TASKS

1	2.6	2.8
2	7.3	12.5
3	33.1	27.8
4	37.1	33.3
5	18.5	23.6

IS THE SPOKESPERSON FOR THE TEAM

1	0.0	2.8
2	4.0	18.1
3	15.2	26.4
4	26.5	29.2
5	51.7	22.2

SCHEDULES WORK TO BE DONE

1	0.7	2.8
2	1.3	2.8
3	4.0	6.9
4	31.8	40.3
5	60.9	45.8

MAINTAINS DEFINITE STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE

1	0.7	2.8
2	3.3	4.2
3	16.6	20.8
4	37.7	38.9
5	41.7	30.6

VALUE	HEAD COACHES	ASSISTANT COACHES
-------	-----------------	----------------------

DOES NOT EXPLAIN OWN ACTIONS

1	5.3	6.9
2	10.6	15.3
3	26.5	16.7
4	35.8	44.4
5	20.5	15.3

KEEPS THE TEAM INFORMED

1	2.0	1.4
2	4.0	8.3
3	12.6	11.1
4	43.0	45.8
5	38.4	33.3

ACTS WITHOUT CONSULTING THE TEAM

1	4.0	1.4
2	14.6	13.9
3	26.5	13.9
4	36.4	44.4
5	16.6	25.0

BACKS UP THE MEMBERS IN THEIR ACTIONS

1	0.7	1.4
2	2.6	8.3
3	31.8	30.6
4	42.4	31.9
5	19.9	26.4

EMPHASIZES THE MEETING OF DEADLINES

1	1.4	2.8
2	4.0	9.7
3	25.8	20.8
4	31.8	36.1
5	35.1	27.8

TREATS ALL TEAM MEMBERS THE SAME

1	5.3	6.9
2	9.9	20.8
3	23.2	27.8
4	33.8	15.3
5	25.8	29.2

VALUE	HEAD COACHES	ASSISTANT COACHES
-------	-----------------	----------------------

ENCOURAGES THE USE OF UNIFORM PROCEDURES

1	0.7	9.7
2	3.3	5.6
3	20.5	30.6
4	36.4	36.1
5	37.1	13.9

GETS EVERYTHING ASKED FOR FROM SUPERIORS

1	6.0	6.9
2	23.8	23.6
3	31.8	26.4
4	25.2	25.0
5	6.0	15.3

IS WILLING TO MAKE CHANGES

1	1.3	1.4
2	3.3	5.6
3	23.8	18.1
4	45.0	38.9
5	26.5	36.1

MAKES SURE HIS/HER PART IN THE ORGANIZATION IS UNDERSTOOD BY TEAM MEMBERS

1	1.3	0.0
2	2.0	5.6
3	11.9	15.3
4	39.1	36.1
5	45.0	43.1

IS FRIENDLY AND APPROACHABLE

1	0.7	1.4
2	5.3	1.4
3	11.9	13.9
4	29.8	25.0
5	52.3	58.3

ASKS THAT TEAM MEMBERS FOLLOW STANDARD RULES AND REGULATIONS

1	0.7	1.4
2	2.0	4.2
3	8.6	13.9
4	37.1	34.7
5	51.0	44.4

VALUE	HEAD COACHES	ASSISTANT COACHES
-------	-----------------	----------------------

DOES NOT TAKE NECESSARY ACTION

1	36.4	23.6
2	25.2	48.6
3	19.2	13.9
4	8.6	8.3
5	6.0	2.8

MAKES TEAM MEMBERS FEEL AT EASE WHEN TALKING TO THEM

1	1.3	1.4
2	7.3	4.2
3	20.5	15.3
4	19.9	30.6
5	49.7	47.2

LETS TEAM MEMBERS KNOW WHAT IS EXPECTED OF THEM

1	0.7	1.4
2	2.0	1.4
3	11.3	9.7
4	34.4	30.6
5	50.3	55.6

SPEAKS AS THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TEAM

1	0.0	4.2
2	3.3	6.9
3	10.6	25.0
4	27.8	36.1
5	55.0	25.0

PUTS SUGGESTIONS MADE BY THE TEAM INTO OPERATION

1	1.3	1.4
2	7.3	4.2
3	27.2	16.7
4	42.4	47.2
5	19.9	26.4

SEES TO IT THAT TEAM MEMBERS ARE WORKING UP TO CAPACITY

1	0.0	2.8
2	2.6	1.4
3	16.6	12.5
4	41.7	37.5
5	35.8	36.1

VALUE	HEAD COACHES	ASSISTANT COACHES
-------	-----------------	----------------------

LETS OTHER PEOPLE LEAD THE TEAM IN HIS/HER PLACE

1	7.3	2.8
2	16.6	16.7
3	33.1	23.6
4	29.1	22.2
5	13.2	19.4

GETS HIS/HER SUPERIORS TO ACT FOR THE WELFARE OF THE TEAM MEMBERS

1	3.3	1.4
2	10.6	9.7
3	27.2	18.1
4	28.5	31.9
5	17.2	26.4

GETS TEAM APPROVAL IN IMPORTANT MATTERS BEFORE GOING AHEAD

1	1.3	0.0
2	11.3	5.6
3	19.9	23.6
4	35.8	36.1
5	19.2	19.4

SEES TO IT THAT THE WORK OF TEAM MEMBERS IS COORDINATED

1	1.3	2.8
2	2.6	2.8
3	13.9	8.3
4	45.7	44.4
5	26.5	26.4

KEEPS THE TEAM WORKING TOGETHER AS A TEAM

1	1.3	0.0
2	2.0	4.2
3	11.9	6.9
4	34.4	33.3
5	37.1	33.3

APPENDIX 10  
QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES BY SEX AND POSITION

Percent values for each question for each coaching category

Values: 1=Never; 2=Seldom; 3=Occasionally; 4=Often; 5=Always

VALUE	MALE HEAD COACH	FEMALE HEAD COACH	MALE ASSISTANT COACH	FEMALE ASSISTANT COACH
-------	-----------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

DOES PERSONAL FAVORS FOR TEAM MEMBERS

1	3.3	11.9	15.3	0.0
2	12.0	39.0	18.6	38.5
3	37.0	22.0	13.6	28.5
4	28.3	16.9	39.0	7.7
5	18.5	10.2	13.6	15.4

MAKES ATTITUDE CLEAR TO THE TEAM

1	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0
2	2.2	3.4	6.8	7.7
3	16.3	10.2	15.3	7.7
4	32.5	44.1	35.6	53.8
5	48.9	40.7	39.0	30.8

DOES LITTLE THINGS TO MAKE IT PLEASANT TO BE A MEMBER OF THE TEAM

1	2.2	6.8	3.4	0.0
2	15.2	3.4	8.5	7.7
3	33.7	22.0	23.7	23.1
4	15.2	42.4	39.0	15.4
5	33.7	23.7	25.4	53.8

TRIES OUT NEW IDEAS ON THE TEAM

1	1.1	0.0	1.7	0.0
2	3.3	3.4	6.8	7.7
3	23.9	30.5	28.8	61.5
4	35.9	42.4	30.5	15.4
5	33.7	23.7	32.2	15.4

ACTS AS THE REAL LEADER OF THE TEAM

1	0.0	3.4	3.4	0.0
2	5.4	1.7	11.9	23.1
3	14.1	10.2	18.6	23.1
4	40.2	13.6	30.5	30.8
5	39.1	71.2	35.6	23.1

IS EASY TO UNDERSTAND

1	2.2	0.0	1.7	0.0
2	14.1	1.7	8.5	0.0
3	18.5	15.3	18.6	7.7
4	35.9	44.1	30.5	23.1
5	29.3	39.0	40.7	69.2



VALUE	MALE HEAD COACH	FEMALE HEAD COACH	MALE ASSISTANT COACH	FEMALE ASSISTANT COACH
-------	-----------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

IS STRICT

1	1.1	5.1	10.2	0.0
2	9.8	8.5	23.7	15.4
3	42.4	32.2	32.2	46.2
4	31.5	40.7	16.9	30.8
5	15.2	13.6	16.9	7.7

FINDS TIME TO LISTEN TO TEAM MEMBERS

1	1.1	1.7	0.0	0.0
2	9.8	1.7	5.1	0.0
3	17.4	22.0	16.9	7.7
4	30.4	35.6	28.8	23.1
5	41.3	37.3	49.2	69.2

CRITICIZES POOR WORK

1	7.6	8.5	11.9	7.7
2	19.6	15.3	20.3	0.0
3	32.6	44.1	20.3	61.5
4	27.2	18.6	28.8	23.1
5	13.0	11.9	18.6	7.7

GIVES ADVANCE NOTICE OF CHANGES

1	5.4	1.7	5.1	0.0
2	14.1	15.3	11.9	7.7
3	26.1	25.4	22.0	30.8
4	38.0	28.8	33.9	23.1
5	15.2	27.1	25.4	38.5

SPEAKS IN A MANNER NOT TO BE QUESTIONED

1	4.3	5.1	13.6	0.0
2	15.2	13.6	20.3	7.7
3	33.7	16.9	18.6	46.2
4	30.4	47.5	28.8	23.1
5	15.2	15.3	15.3	15.4

KEEPS TO HIMSELF/HERSELF

1	4.3	3.4	5.1	0.0
2	7.6	6.8	10.2	7.7
3	22.8	23.7	16.9	15.4
4	44.6	40.7	33.9	30.8
5	18.5	23.7	30.5	38.5

VALUE	MALE HEAD COACH	FEMALE HEAD COACH	MALE ASSISTANT COACH	FEMALE ASSISTANT COACH
-------	-----------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

LOOKS OUT FOR THE PERSONAL WELFARE OF INDIVIDUAL TEAM MEMBERS

1	0.0	1.7	1.7	0.0
2	4.3	0.0	5.1	0.0
3	18.5	20.3	15.3	23.1
4	37.0	25.4	25.4	38.5
5	39.1	47.5	52.5	38.5

ASSIGNS TEAM MEMBERS TO PARTICULAR TASKS

1	3.3	1.7	3.4	0.0
2	7.6	6.8	13.6	7.7
3	29.3	39.0	23.7	46.2
4	40.2	32.2	37.3	15.4
5	18.5	18.6	22.0	30.8

IS THE SPOKESPERSON FOR THE TEAM

1	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0
2	5.4	1.7	22.0	0.0
3	17.4	11.9	25.4	30.8
4	32.6	16.9	25.4	46.2
5	42.4	66.1	23.7	15.4

SCHEDULES WORK TO BE DONE

1	0.0	1.7	3.4	0.0
2	1.1	1.7	3.4	0.0
3	5.4	1.7	5.1	15.4
4	31.5	32.2	39.0	46.2
5	60.9	61.0	47.5	38.5

MAINTAINS DEFINITE STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE

1	1.1	0.0	3.4	0.0
2	4.3	1.7	3.4	7.7
3	17.4	15.3	16.9	38.5
4	38.0	37.3	37.3	46.2
5	39.1	45.8	35.6	7.7

DOES NOT EXPLAIN OWN ACTIONS

1	3.3	8.5	6.8	7.7
2	13.0	6.8	15.3	15.4
3	25.0	28.8	16.9	15.4
4	40.2	28.8	40.7	61.5
5	16.3	27.1	18.6	0.0

VALUE	MALE HEAD COACH	FEMALE HEAD COACH	MALE ASSISTANT COACH	FEMALE ASSISTANT COACH
-------	-----------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

KEEPS THE TEAM INFORMED

1	1.1	3.4	1.7	0.0
2	4.3	3.4	8.5	7.7
3	13.0	11.9	10.2	15.4
4	40.2	47.5	44.1	53.8
5	41.3	33.9	35.6	23.1

ACTS WITHOUT CONSULTING THE TEAM

1	3.3	5.1	1.7	0.0
2	15.2	13.6	11.9	23.1
3	26.1	27.1	16.9	0.0
4	34.8	39.0	42.4	53.8
5	18.5	13.6	27.1	15.4

BACKS UP MEMBERS IN THEIR ACTIONS

1	0.0	1.7	1.7	0.0
2	3.3	1.7	8.5	7.7
3	33.7	28.8	33.9	15.4
4	40.2	45.8	27.1	53.8
5	20.7	18.6	27.1	23.1

EMPHASIZES THE MEETING OF DEADLINES

1	1.1	1.7	3.4	0.0
2	4.3	3.4	10.2	7.7
3	30.4	18.6	23.7	7.7
4	35.9	25.4	30.5	61.5
5	26.1	49.2	28.8	23.1

TREATS ALL TEAM MEMBERS THE SAME

1	6.5	3.4	8.5	0.0
2	12.0	6.8	22.0	15.4
3	29.3	13.6	25.4	38.5
4	28.3	42.4	11.9	30.8
5	22.8	30.5	32.2	30.8

ENCOURAGES THE USE OF UNIFORM PROCEDURES

1	0.0	1.7	11.9	0.0
2	3.3	3.4	6.8	0.0
3	19.6	22.0	30.5	30.8
4	45.7	22.0	32.2	53.8
5	29.3	49.2	15.3	7.7

VALUE	MALE HEAD COACH	FEMALE HEAD COACH	MALE ASSISTANT COACH	FEMALE ASSISTANT COACH
-------	-----------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

GETS EVERYTHING ASKED FOR FROM SUPERIORS

1	6.5	5.1	8.5	0.0
2	10.9	44.1	20.3	38.5
3	38.0	22.0	25.4	30.8
4	28.3	20.3	25.4	23.1
5	7.6	3.4	16.9	7.7

IS WILLING TO MAKE CHANGES

1	2.2	0.0	1.7	0.0
2	2.2	5.1	6.8	0.0
3	27.2	18.6	16.9	23.1
4	37.0	57.6	35.6	53.8
5	31.5	18.6	39.0	23.1

MAKES SURE HIS/HER OWN PART IN THE ORGANIZATION IS UNDERSTOOD BY TEAM MEMBERS

1	1.1	1.7	0.0	0.0
2	3.3	0.0	5.1	7.7
3	16.3	5.1	15.3	15.4
4	37.0	42.4	33.9	46.2
5	41.3	50.8	45.8	30.8

IS FRIENDLY AND APPROACHABLE

1	0.0	1.7	1.7	0.0
2	7.6	1.7	1.7	0.0
3	9.8	15.3	11.9	23.1
4	30.4	28.8	28.8	7.7
5	52.2	52.5	55.9	69.2

ASKS THAT TEAM MEMBERS FOLLOW STANDARD RULES AND REGULATIONS

1	1.1	0.0	1.7	0.0
2	0.0	5.1	5.1	0.0
3	7.6	10.2	11.9	23.1
4	40.2	32.2	33.9	38.5
5	50.0	52.5	45.8	38.5

DOES NOT TAKE NECESSARY ACTION

1	28.3	49.2	25.4	15.4
2	21.7	30.5	44.1	69.2
3	26.1	8.5	15.3	7.7
4	12.0	3.4	8.5	7.7
5	5.4	6.8	3.4	0.0

VALUE	MALE HEAD COACH	FEMALE HEAD COACH	MALE ASSISTANT COACH	FEMALE ASSISTANT COACH
-------	-----------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

MAKES TEAM MEMBERS FEEL AT EASE WHEN TALKING TO THEM

1	1.1	1.7	1.7	0.0
2	9.8	3.4	3.4	7.7
3	21.7	18.6	16.9	7.7
4	23.9	13.6	30.5	30.8
5	42.4	61.0	45.8	53.8

LETS TEAM MEMBERS KNOW WHAT IS EXPECTED OF THEM

1	1.1	0.0	1.7	0.0
2	3.3	0.0	1.7	0.0
3	14.1	6.8	6.8	23.1
4	31.5	39.0	37.3	0.0
5	48.9	52.5	50.8	76.9

SPEAKS AS THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TEAM

1	0.0	0.0	5.1	0.0
2	4.3	1.7	8.5	0.0
3	12.0	8.5	27.1	15.4
4	28.3	27.1	30.5	61.5
5	51.1	61.0	25.4	23.1

PUTS SUGGESTIONS MADE BY THE TEAM INTO OPERATION

1	0.0	3.4	1.7	0.0
2	8.7	5.1	3.4	7.7
3	26.1	28.8	18.6	7.7
4	45.7	37.3	49.2	38.5
5	19.6	20.3	25.4	30.8

SEES TO IT THAT TEAM MEMBERS ARE WORKING UP TO CAPACITY

1	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0
2	2.2	3.4	1.7	0.0
3	23.9	5.1	10.2	23.1
4	38.0	47.5	37.3	38.5
5	31.5	42.4	40.7	15.4

LETS OTHER PEOPLE LEAD THE TEAM IN HIS/HER PLACE

1	5.4	10.2	3.4	0.0
2	20.7	10.2	16.9	15.4
3	33.7	32.2	25.4	15.4
4	23.9	37.3	18.6	38.5
5	15.2	10.2	22.0	7.7

VALUE	MALE HEAD COACH	FEMALE HEAD COACH	MALE ASSISTANT COACH	FEMALE ASSISTANT COACH
-------	-----------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

GETS HIS/HER SUPERIORS TO ACT FOR THE WELFARE OF THE TEAM MEMBERS

1	1.1	6.8	1.7	0.0
2	10.9	10.2	10.2	7.7
3	23.9	32.2	18.6	15.4
4	29.3	27.1	35.6	15.4
5	19.6	13.6	23.7	38.5

GETS TEAM APPROVAL IN IMPORTANT MATTERS BEFORE GOING AHEAD

1	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0
2	9.8	13.6	5.1	7.7
3	25.0	11.9	25.4	15.4
4	32.6	40.7	33.9	46.2
5	19.6	18.6	20.3	15.4

SEES TO IT THAT THE WORK OF THE TEAM MEMBERS IS COORDINATED

1	1.1	1.7	1.7	7.7
2	2.2	3.4	3.4	0.0
3	17.4	8.5	8.5	7.7
4	40.2	54.2	45.8	38.5
5	27.2	25.4	28.8	15.4

KEEPS THE TEAM WORKING TOGETHER AS A TEAM

1	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
2	2.2	1.7	5.1	0.0
3	16.3	5.1	6.8	7.7
4	35.9	32.2	33.9	30.8
5	29.3	49.2	35.6	23.1

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Ruth M. "Assessment of coaching performance." Coaching Clinic. Nov. (1968): 1-8
- Avery, Marybell and Lumpkin, Angela. "Students' perceptions of physical education objectives." Journal of Teaching in Physical Education. 7 (1987): 5-11.
- Bailey, Charles T. "Athletes' perceptions of coaches." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Utah. 1972
- Behrman, E. G. "Personality differences between non-swimmers and swimmers." Research Quarterly. 38 (1967): 163-171.
- Bird, Anne E. and Cripe, Bernette K. Psychology and Sport Behavior. St. Louis MO: Times Mirror/Mosby College Publishing, 1986.
- Booth, E. G. "Personality traits of athletes measured by the M.M.P.I." Research Quarterly. 29 (1958): 127-138.
- Bosco, J. S. "The physical and personality characteristics of champion male gymnasts." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Illinois. 1962.
- Brandt, David and Elam, Reid P. "A survey of leadership styles of high school coaches in El Paso county." Texas Coach. Sept. (1987): 48-49.
- Brown, Janie Poole. "A description of dyadic student/teacher interactions in the physical education activity class." Doctoral Dissertation. University of North Carolina at Greensboro. 1980.
- Buckiewicz, Daine R. "An analysis of leader behavior in the physical education departments of the community colleges of California, Oregon, and Washington." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Oregon. 1974.
- Buckiewicz, Frank A. "An investigation of leadership behavior in athletic departments of selected universities and colleges." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Oregon. 1974.
- Buher, N. "Perceptions of the 'Woman Athlete' and the 'Woman Coach.'" Masters Thesis. University of North Carolina at Greensboro. 1990.

- Butterfield, D. Anthony and Powell, Gary N. "Effect of group performance, leader, sex, and rater sex on ratings of leader behavior." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. 28 (1981): 129-141.
- Callaway, Deborah Johnson. "A comparison of leadership styles of successful and unsuccessful collegiate female basketball coaches." Doctoral Dissertation. Virginia Polytechnic Institute. 1989.
- Carron, Albert V. "Role behavior and the coach-athlete interaction." International Review of Sports Sociology. 2 (13): 1978: 51-64.
- . Social Psychology of Sport. Ithaca, NY: Movement Publications, 1980.
- Carron, A. V. and Bennett, B. B. "Compatibility in the coach-athlete dyad." Research Quarterly. 48 (1977) 671-679.
- Carson, Joseph O. "An analysis of the leader behavior of junior college deans as viewed by student leaders." Doctoral Dissertation. Florida State University. 1962.
- Cheffers, J. and Lombardo, B. "Variability in teaching behavior and interaction in the gymnasium." Journal of Teaching in Physical Education. 2 (3) (1983): 33-35.
- Cheffers, J.; Mancini, V.; and Martinek, T. Interaction analysis: An application to nonverbal activity. St. Paul, MN.: P.S. Amidon, 1980.
- Chelladurai, P. and Selah, S. D. "Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: Development of a leadership scale." Journal of Sport Psychology. 3 (1980): 34-35
- Chelladurai, P. "Discrepancy between preferences and perceptions of leadership behavior and satisfaction of athletes in varying sports." Journal of Sport Psychology. 6 (1984): 27-41.
- Cicciarella, Charles F. and Martinek, T. J. "A micro-computer program for real time collection and immediate analysis of observational data." Journal of Teaching in Physical Education. 2 (1): 1982: 56-62.
- Clark, Marilyn L. "An assessment of characteristics of successful women intercollegiate athletic coaches." Doctoral Dissertation. Indiana University. 1974.



- Clay, John. "Personality traits of female intercollegiate athletes and female intercollegiate athletic coaches." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Utah. 1984.
- Corey, M. S. and Corey, G. Groups: Process and Practice. Monterey, CA.: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1987.
- Cox, Richard H. Sport Psychology: Concepts and Applications. Dubuque, IA. Wm. C. Brown Pub., 1985.
- Cox, Edward W. "Superiors' and subordinates' perceptions and expectations of the leader behavior of the dean's of instruction: A survey of the North Carolina community college system." Doctoral Dissertation. University of North Carolina at Greensboro. 1983.
- Cratty, B. J. Social Psychology in Athletics. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1981.
- , Psychology in contemporary sport: Guidelines for coaches and athletes. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1984.
- Dallman, G. W. "An analysis of the differences between selected personality traits of successful and unsuccessful coaches in football, wrestling and basketball." Masters Thesis. University of Wisconsin at La Crosse, 1973.
- Daniel, Mary R. "The development of a tool to measure perceptions of physical education teaching behaviors found in secondary schools." Doctoral Dissertation. University of North Carolina at Greensboro. 1984.
- Danielson, R. R. "Leadership in coaching: description and evaluation." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Alberta. 1974.
- Danielson, R.; Zelhart, P. F.; and Drake, C. J. "Multidimensional scaling and factor analysis of coaching behavior as perceived by high school hockey players." Research Quarterly. 46 (1974): 323-334.
- Egan, Gerard. Face to Face: The small group experience and interpersonal growth. Monterey CA.: Brooks/Cole Publishing, Co., 1973.
- Eggert, Sandra R. "Coaching success in women's athletics: The relationship of selected factors." Doctoral Dissertation. Brigham Young University. 1978.

- Elmore, M. W. "Investigation of high school athletes' perceptions of ideal coaching personalities." Masters Thesis. Washington State University. 1985.
- Espagnac, S. "The coach, figure in the shadows: multiple portrait." Olympic Review. 242 (1987): 654-657.
- Evans, Virden. "A study of perceptions held by high school athletes toward coaches." International Review of Sport Sociology. 2 (13): (1978): 45-55.
- Fankhauser, Nancy. "An analysis of female high school athletes' real and ideal perceptions of their volleyball coaches." Masters Thesis. University of Kansas. 1988.
- Fiedler, F. E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.
- Flanders, N. Analyzing Teaching Behavior. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1970.
- Franks, Ray, ed., The 1990-1991 National Directory of College Athletics (Women's Edition). Amarillo, TX: Ray Franks Publishing Ranch, 1991.
- Friedrichs, Warren D. "The influence of leader behaviors coach attitudes, and institutional variables on performance and satisfaction of collegiate basketball teams." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Oregon. 1984.
- Gaintner, G. L. "Athletes' and coaches' expectations of coaches." Doctoral Dissertation. Arizona State University. 1986.
- Gates, Kirby W. "Personality traits of athletic coaches." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Utah. 1982.
- George, J. J. "Discovering Roots: Destiny - Athletics leadership among young women." The Physical Educator. 45 (2): (1988): 80-85.
- Gill, Diane I. and Perry, Jean L. "A case study of leadership in women's intercollegiate softball." International Review of Sport Sociology. 2 (14): (1979): 83-90.
- Gold, M. "A comparison of personality characteristics of professional and college varsity tennis and golf players as measured by the Guilford Marten Personality Inventory." Masters Thesis. University of Maryland. 1955.

- Grastorf, Jane E. "Nonverbal behaviors of collegiate female volleyball and basketball coaches as recalled by athletes and coaches." Doctoral Dissertation. University of North Carolina at Greensboro. 1980.
- Green, L. B. "The relationship between leadership style, performance variables, and a specific self-concept of ability." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Northern Colorado. 1990.
- Hall, J. T.; Cooper, J. M.; Frost, R. B.; and Shenk, H., eds. Administration: Principles, Theory and Practice with Applications to Physical Education. Pacific Plaisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing Co., Inc., 1973.
- Halpin, A. W. Manual for the Leader Behavior Description questionnaire. Columbus OH.: The Ohio State University, 1957.
- Hartman, David B. "Personality Characteristics of selected basketball coaches." Masters Thesis. Mankato State University. 1972.
- Hastad, Douglas N. "Authoritarianism and its relationship to success in coaching high school football and basketball." Masters Thesis. Washington State University. 1972.
- Heller, Gertrude M. "A comparative study of women and men in organizational leadership roles." Doctoral Dissertation. Temple University. 1978.
- Helms, Carol Sue. "A study of the personality traits of selected 1979-1980 A.I.A.W. Division I basketball coaches." Masters Thesis. Stephen F. Austin University. 1980.
- Hendry, L. B. "A personality study of highly successful and ideal swimming coaches." Research Quarterly. 40 (1969): 299-304.
- Hile, Mary E. "Leadership behavior of male and female coaches of women's intercollegiate basketball teams." Masters Thesis, California State University at Long Beach, 1985.
- Hill, Sandee L. "The temperament traits of women who coach team sports and individual sports on the intercollegiate level." Doctoral Dissertation. University of North Carolina at Greensboro. 1978.
- Hodges, Carolyn Virginia. "Comparison of responses of basketball coaches and players to situation-response survey." Doctoral Dissertation. University of North Carolina at Greensboro. 1983.

- Hollander, E. F. Leaders, Groups, and Influence. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Horne, Tammy and Carron, Albert. "Compatibility in coach-athlete relationships." Journal of Sport Psychology. 7 (1985): 137-149.
- House, R. S. "A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness." Administrative science Quarterly. 16 (1971): 321-338.
- Inciong, Phillip Alexander. "Leadership styles and team success." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Utah. 1974.
- Iso-Ahola, Sappo E. and Hatfield, Brad. The Psychology of Sports: A social psychological approach. Dubuque, IA.: Wm. C. Brown Co., Publishers, 1986.
- Jerome, W. "A study of the personality characteristics of female athletes and non-participants." Masters Thesis. University of Oregon. 1969.
- Johns, Horace E. "Effects of social distance on perceptions of leader behaviors." Leadership and Organization Development Journal. 7 (5): (1986):
- Johnson, Kay Ann. "The perceived real and ideal leader behavior of selected male and female department heads of physical education in colleges and universities." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Georgia. 1982.
- Johnson, P. A. "A comparison of personality traits of superior skilled women athletes in basketball, bowling, field hockey, and golf." Research Quarterly. 43 (1972): 409-411.
- Jones, D. C. "Critical requirements for coaching women's intercollegiate volleyball in Illinois." Masters Thesis. Western Illinois University. 1975
- Kane, J. E. "The description of sport types using the 16 PF." Research Quarterly. 23 (1969): 391-396.
- Kearns, L. A. "The relationship of leadership and personality to success in coaching collegiate women's basketball." Masters Thesis. Illinois State University. 1986.
- Kemp, Joann. "Perceptions of leader behavior of selected women physical education administrators." Doctoral Dissertation. University of North Carolina at Greensboro. 1977.

- Knapp, B. "The personality of lawn tennis players." Bulletin of the British Psychological Journal. October, 1965.
- Kroll, W. and Carlson, R. "Discriminant function and hierarchical grouping analysis of karate participants' personality profiles." Research Quarterly. 38 (1967): 405-411.
- Lacy, A. C. "Systematic observation of behaviors of winning high school head football coaches." Doctoral Dissertation. Arizona State University. 1983.
- LaGrand, Louis E. "What athletes look for in their coaches." Scholastic Coach. Nov. (1983): 92-94.
- Lewin, K. and Lippitt, R. "An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A Preliminary Note." Sociometry. 1938.
- Lewis, Kathryn. "Leadership: A success factor for women volleyball coaches." Doctoral Dissertation. Brigham Young University. 1978.
- Lombardo, Bennett J. and Cheffers, J. T. F. "Variability in teaching behavior and interaction in the gymnasium." Journal of Teaching in Physical Education. 12 (1983): 33-48.
- Lowry, Carla d'Estella. "Leadership functions, source of power, and sources of group attraction involved in women's intercollegiate team groups." Doctoral Dissertation. Texas Women's University. 1972.
- Lumley, Mary. "Achievement motivation and leader behavior of physical education administrators." Masters Thesis. University of Western Ontario. 1971.
- Malumphy, T. "Personality of women athletes in intercollegiate competition." Research Quarterly. 39 (1968): 610-620.
- Mancini, Victor H. and Agnew, M. "An analysis of teaching behaviors." In Sport Psychology: An analysis of athlete behavior. Movement Publications, 1980.
- Martens, Rainer. Coaches' Guide to Sport Psychology. Champaign, IL.: Human Kinetics Publishers, 1987.

- Martinek, T. J. and Cicciarella, C. F. "A microcomputer for real time collection and immediate analysis of observational data." Journal of Teaching in Physical Education. 2 (1): (1982): 56-58.
- Meyer, Ruth Ann. "Likert's management system theory: An analysis of perceptions by faculty, department chairs and selected administrators at ranked physical education doctoral departments in the United States." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Iowa. 1984.
- Milner, Keith. "Contemporary study of leadership behavior of male and female heads of departments of physical education in universities and colleges." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Iowa. 1976.
- Misumi, Jyui. The Behavioral Science of Leadership: An interdisciplinary Japanese research program. Ann Arbor, MI.: The University of Michigan Press, 1985.
- Model, Randy Lance. "Coaching behaviors of non-winning high school football coaches in Arizona." Doctoral Dissertation. Arizona State University. 1983.
- Neal, Patsy. Coaching Aids for Women. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1978.
- Nelson, D. D. "Leadership in Sports." Research Quarterly. 37 (1966): 268-275.
- Newcomb, Connie K. "Attitudes of female athletes towards their male and female coaches." Masters Thesis. Texas A & M University. 1977.
- Nimchick, Paul S. "Attitudes of female collegiate swimmers toward male and female coaches." Masters Thesis. Springfield College. 1977.
- Officer, Sara A and Rosenfeld, L. B. "Self-disclosure to male and female coaches by female high school athletes." Journal of Sport Psychology. 7 (1985): 360-370.
- Ogilvie, B. C. "Personality profiles of successful coaches." A. Ryan, ed., Proceedings, Sports Injury Clinic. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1965.
- Ogilvie, B. C. and Tutko, T. A. Problem athletes and how to handle them. London: Pelham, 1966.

- Ortelee, Mary M. "Personality trait differences of female intercollegiate team sports and individual sport coaches." Masters Thesis. Lamar University. 1983.
- Palmer, Guy Mathew. "A study of relationships of leadership behavior, organizational climate, and demographic data in physical education departments at selected colleges and universities in Canada and the United States." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Oregon. 1982.
- Parkhouse, Robert J. Differential effects of sex and status on evaluation of coaching ability." Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport. 57 (1986): 53-59.
- Fatrow, Robert J. "Psychosocial characteristics of coaches and their relationships to coaching success." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Utah. 1971.
- Peterson, S. L.; Weber, J. C.; and Trousdale, W. W. "Personality traits of women in team sports versus women in individual sports." Research Quarterly. 38 (1967): 686-690.
- Phillips, D. Allen and Carlisle, Cynthia. "The physical education teacher assessment instrument." Journal of Teaching in Physical Education. 12 (2): 1983: 62-76.
- Rath, A. L. The head coach's leadership role as perceived by the head coach and by the athletes." Masters Thesis. Southwest Texas State University. 1983.
- Rider, Richard H. "Personality traits of basketball coaches as perceived by coaches and their players." Masters Thesis. University of Utah. 1971.
- Sage, G. H. "An occupational analysis of the college coach." In Sport and Social Order. Edited by Bell, D. and Loy, J. W. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley, 1975.
- Schliesman, Earl S. "Relationship between the congruence of preferred and actual leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction with leadership." Journal of Sport Behavior. 10 (1987): 157-166.
- Schroeder, B. J. "Leadership behavior of female collegiate coaches as perceived by athletes in relation to team success." Masters Thesis. Western Illinois University. 1978.

- Schultz, W. C. The Interpersonal Underworld. Palo Alto, CA.: Science Behavior Books, 1966.
- Seymour, E. W. "Comparative study of certain behavior characteristics of participant and non-participant boys in Little League baseball." Research Quarterly. 27 (1956): 338-346.
- Shyrock, Henry S. and Siegal, Jacob S. The Methods and Materials of Demography. New York: Academic Press, 1972.
- Silva, John M. III and Weinberg, Robert S. eds. Psychological Foundations of Sport. Champaign, IL Human Kinetics Publishers, 1985.
- Simpson, W. K. "A theoretical model for predicted potential coaching success in women's intercollegiate basketball based on the centrality theory, coaching theories, academic preparation and related variables." Doctoral Dissertation. Texas A & M University. 1984.
- Smith, L. M. and Lutz, F. W. "Teachers, leader behavior and pupil respect and liking." The Journal of Educational Research. 57 (1964): 434-436.
- Smith, R. E.; Smoll, F. L.; and Hunt, E. "A system for the behavioral assessment of athletic coaches." Research Quarterly. 48 (1977): 401-407.
- Smoll, Frank L. and Smith, Ronald E. Psychological Perspectives in Youth Sports. New York: Hemisphere Publishing, Co., 1978.
- Stallard, Mary L. "Female intercollegiate basketball players' perceptions of their coaches." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Utah. 1984.
- Stanek, Pamela J. "A study of interpersonal behavior characteristics of male and female collegiate coaches." Masters Thesis. Western Illinois University. 1977.
- Stein, J. B. "Personality perception in coaching and its relationship to contest success." Masters Thesis. University of Wisconsin at Madison. 1979.
- Steinbrecher, William L.; Kearney, Jay T.; and Noland, Melody. "Students' perception of the coaches role in athletics." Physical Educator. March (1978) 11-14.



- Stogdill, Ralph. Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research. New York: The Free Press, 1974.
- Straub, William F., ed. Sport Psychology: An Analysis of Athlete Behavior. Ithaca, NY.: Movement Publications, 1980.
- Sunderland, Jan D. "A comparison of the leadership attitudes of male and female athletic directors." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Oregon. 1981.
- Tamsberg, Mary C. "Competencies for coaching female athletes." Masters Thesis. University of Wisconsin at Madison. 1978.
- Taylor, Jim. "A review of validity issues in sport psychological research: types, problems, solutions." Journal of Sport Behavior. 10 (1987): 3-14.
- Vasquez, Juan H. "An analysis of the relationship of athletic director job satisfaction and leadership behavior in the three divisions of the N.C.A.A. and in the N.A.I.A." Doctoral Dissertation. Florida State University. 1982.
- Verbeke, M. G. "The junior college academic dean's leadership behavior as viewed by superiors and faculty.: Doctoral Dissertation. Penn State University. 1966.
- Vienneau, Jean-Guy. "A study of leadership behavior of volunteer administrators in amateur sports organizations in the Province of New Brunswick, Canada." Doctoral Dissertation. Florida State University. 1982.
- Von Strache, C. "Players' perceptions of leadership qualities for coaches." Research Quarterly. 50 (1979): 679-686.
- Walter, J. L. "Leadership: Considerations and implications for women in physical education." Masters Thesis. University of North Carolina at Greensboro. 1968.
- Waldenberger, R. W. "An analysis of leader behavior, group interaction and organizational climate in physical education departments of selected Canadian universities." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Oregon. 1975.

- Wardell, David B. "A cross-sport comparison of leadership styles and team success." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Utah. 1990.
- Watkins, David L. "Leader behavior of directors of athletics at eight liberal arts colleges." Doctoral Dissertation. Penn State University. 1983.
- Weinberg, Robert; Reveles, Margie; and Jackson, Allen. "Attitudes of male and female athletes toward male and female coaches." Journal of Sport Psychology. 6 (1985): 448-453.
- Whitman, Walt. Leaves of Grass. Ithaca, NY.: Great Seal Books, Cornell University Press, 1961.
- Williams, D. M. "A comparison of self-perceptions of leadership qualities of men and women coaches in the Western Pennsylvania Interscholastic Athletic League." Masters Thesis. Slippery Rock University. 1987.
- Williams, Linda C. "Relationship of sex of coach, level of school, and type of sport on measures of actual and ideal leadership behavior." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Southern California. 1982.
- Wisnieski, Mary. "Comparative study of leadership behavior of tennis and softball coaches." Masters Thesis. University of Florida. 1980.
- Wofford, J.C. and Srinivasan, T. N. "Experimental tests of the Leader-Environmental-Follower Interaction Theory of leadership." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. NO.: Academic Press, Inc. 1983.
- Young, Judith C. "The relationship among leader characteristics of male and female basketball coaches and team performance." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Maryland. 1981.